

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIV.

APRIL, 1910.

No. 2.

THE VICAR OF CHRIST.

III.

Suppose Peter had been the "Prince" of the Apostles, did he have the power to give this lordship to his successor? And if he had the power, did he do so? Where is it written in the Bible? Where is it written in History?

1. The Emperors recognized no "Vicar of Christ."

Pope Leo X, in the Lateran Synod of 1516, said, "It is manifestly established that the Roman Pontiff for the time being, as having authority over all councils, has alone the full power of convoking, transferring, dissolving;" a claim made no earlier than 785 by Hadrian I. — This is manifestly untrue.

The Emperor Constantine called the First General Council at Nicaea, in Bithynia, in 325; the Emperor made the opening address; the Emperor presided for a time; the Emperor formally confirmed the acts of the council; some of the main sessions were held in the Emperor's palace; the ecclesiastical president was Bishop Hosius of Cordova, not the Roman Bishop Sylvester or his Legates.

The Second General Council, at Constantinople, in 381, was called by the Emperor Theodosius alone. The Pope was neither present nor represented. The Emperor alone confirmed the acts of the Council.

After the division of the Roman Empire, in 395, the Emperors Theodosius II and Valentinian III called the Third General Council, at Ephesus, in 431; the Emperor bade the

Bishops depart; the Emperor restored Cyril and Memnon; the Emperor ordered the writings of Nestorius burned.

The Emperors Valentinian and Marcian called the Fourth General Council to Chalcedon, in 451, and presided; the Emperor called the Council in spite of the protest of Pope Leo I; the Emperor confirmed the acts of the Council in 452.

The Emperor Justinian I called the Fifth General Council, to Constantinople, in 553. Though Pope Vigilius was in the city, he did not preside; he was censured.

The Emperor Constantius Pogonatus called the Sixth General Council, at Constantinople, in 680, which was held in a part of the Emperor's palace. The Emperor ordered what was to be done, what order was to be observed, who was to speak, who was to keep silence. The Council declared Pope Honorius a heretic.

The Empress Irene called the Seventh General Council, at Nicaea, in 787. The Patriarch Tarasius of Constantinople led the proceedings, together with Petronas and John, the imperial commissioners.

The Emperor Basilius called the Eighth General Council, at Constantinople, in 869. The last Councils were poorly attended by the Westerners.

According to history, the emperors were either blissfully ignorant of, or they calmly ignored, the "Vicar of Christ."

2. *The early liturgies know nothing of the "Vicar of Christ."*

Of seventeen liturgies from the various parts of the world none favors Peter's supremacy, the most of them are plainly and positively against the claim. The ancient liturgy of St. James, for instance, describes the "Holy Catholic Church" as "founded on the Rock of faith, that the gates of hell may not prevail against it." (Littledale, *Petrine Claims*, 60—69.)

The Roman Missal is of the very highest authority in the Roman Church. The collect for the Vigil of SS. Peter and Paul speaks of "the rock of the Apostolic Confession," and the Council of Trent speaks of the Faith "as the firm and only

foundation, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail." (Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 80. 81.)

Pope Urban III, in a letter of 1185, says the Church is "founded upon a rock which is based upon the solidity of the Faith, a foundation bestowed upon her in the strength of the Apostolic Confession."

Pope Celestine III, writing in 1196, says, "*The Truth* thus speaking of *Himself*, 'Upon this rock will I build my Church.'" (*Ang. Brief*, p. 24.)

3. *The early Church Fathers did not know that the Pope as Peter's successor was the "Vicar of Christ."*

Pope Clement, who died in 101, thinks Paul won the prize of honor and is the greatest model. (Schick, p. 51.)

St. Cyprian writes: "Assuredly, the rest of the Apostles were also the same as was Peter, endowed with a like partnership both of honor and power." (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 71.)

Ambrose of Milan, who died in 397, thinks Peter and Paul equal in rank of honor.

Origen writes: "If you think the whole Church built upon Peter alone, what will you say of John, the Son of Thunder, or each one of the Apostles? And are we to dare to say that the 'gates of hell' shall not prevail against Peter only, but that they shall prevail against the other Apostles and those who are perfect? Are not the words, 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it,' and 'Upon this rock will I build my Church,' said of *them all*, and of each single one of them?" (Oxenham, p. 30; *North Am. Rev.*, Dec., 1907, p. 587; Littledale, *P. C.*, 72.)

Jerome (*Ep.*, p. 146) writes: "If it is a question of authority, the world is greater than the city. Wherever there is a bishop, at Rome, or at Eugubium, or at Constantinople, or at Rhegium, or at Alexandria, or at Tanis, he has the same worth, the same priesthood. The power of wealth or the humility of poverty do not make a bishop higher or lower. They are all successors of the Apostles." (Gore, *R. C. C.*, p. 116; Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 70—90.)

4. If the emperors, and the liturgies, and the Fathers know of no Pope as the Vicar of Christ, *surely we can easily find him plainly in the Canons and Decrees of the Councils of the Church?* If anywhere, he ought certainly be found there.

The "Canons of the Apostles" know only the "first bishop" of each nation, who is to do naught without the consent of all. (34th Canon.)

The Council of Laodicea knows nothing higher or more central than the metropolitans.

The First General Council, of Nicaea, in 325, provides that the Patriarch of Alexandria should have the same authority over the churches of his province as the Pope of Rome over the churches of his province, the "suburbicarian" churches, *i. e.*, of Central and Southern Italy, with Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica.

The Council of Antioch, in 341, forbids appeals beyond the provincial synod under the metropolitan.

In 343 or 347 the *local* Council of Sardica granted to Julius the closely restricted right to order the hearing of certain appeals. This was rejected by the Eastern and African churches, and repealed by the ninth canon of the General Council of Chalcedon, which instituted a system of appeals, in which the name of the Roman See does not so much as appear. Even this canon, as a Sardican canon, has been pronounced spurious by the Roman theologian Aloysius Vincenzi in a book from the Vatican press, in 1875. (Littledale, *P. R.*, pp. 121. 238; *P. C.*, pp. 93—96.)

The Second General Council, that of Constantinople, in 381, virtually repealed the alleged Sardican Canons and enacted that the Bishop of Constantinople shall have precedence of honor next after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome; a civil and political reason, not a religious reason.

Of the nine Roman councils during the fourth century, the one in 386, under Siricius, forbids the consecration of a

bishop without the *knowledge* of the Roman patriarch; nothing is said as to his *consent*.

In the Council of Carthage, in 418, Faustinus, one of the Roman legates, asked that the right of appeal to Rome be allowed, since it was given by the Sardican Canons, which he alleged to be Canons of the Council of Nicaea. This was challenged, and the matter was to be verified. All appeals over sea were forbidden under pain of excommunication. They wrote Pope Boniface I that they would not tolerate his insolence in reinstating the deposed priest Apiarius. One of the signers was Augustine.

The Carthage Council, of 424, wrote Pope Celestine that the Sardican Canons were not Nicene Canons at all, and asked him to send no more legates, since they could settle their own affairs better than he.

The Third General Council, of Ephesus, in 431, disregarded the action of Pope Celestine deposing Nestorius of Constantinople, and asked this Archbishop to take his seat. He was deposed after proof of his guilt was furnished, not in virtue of the Pope's judgment. The Eighth Canon provides that no bishop shall invade any province which was not from the beginning under his jurisdiction, "lest the pride of power should creep in under the pretext of a sacred office, and thus we might unknowingly and gradually lose that freedom which Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior of all men, obtained for us with His precious blood, and bestowed upon us." Almost prophetic foresight! (*Our Brief*, p. 34.)

The Fourth General Council, that of Chalcedon, in 451, received the teaching of Pope Leo I of Rome; the orthodoxy was questioned; for five days it was examined; then 160 bishops publicly declared their acceptance of it, only because it agreed with St. Cyril's teaching, and with the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople. And even the Roman legate, Paschasinus, for himself and his colleagues, said thus, "It is clear that the faith of Pope Leo is the same as that of the Fathers of Nicaea and Constantinople, and that there is no

difference. That is the reason why the Pope's letter, which has restated this faith because of the heresy of Eutyches, has been received." (Littledale, *P. R.*, p. 239.)

The Fourth General Council, that of Chalcedon, in 451, said: "The Fathers with good reason bestowed precedence on the chair of Old Rome, because it was the imperial city." So it was not a divine institution, and it was for a political reason. Pope Leo I resisted this Canon, yet on the purely technical grounds of conflict with the sixth Nicene Canon, which gave the second place to Alexandria. (Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 99—106.) Leo admitted the orthodoxy of the Council. Had the supremacy of Peter been of divine origin, it would have been heresy to deny or ignore it, and the Council would not have been orthodox. (*Ang. Br.*, p. 43.) This precedence gave to Rome no jurisdiction over the other churches.

From the twelve Roman synods during the fifth century we learn that Bishop Hilary of Arles resisted the Bishop of Rome, never retracted, and yet is a saint and a Doctor of the Roman Church, and that Pope Gelasius, in 496, wrote: "It is the duty of pontiffs to obey the imperial ordinances in all things temporal."

The Synodus Palmaris of 76 bishops virtually tried Pope Symmachus, in 501, who had been accused of grave crimes before Theodoric the Ostrogoth.

During the sixth century many councils were held in Gaul and Spain, yet we find only one reference to the Pope, enjoining him to be prayed for at every mass. The Council of Lyons, in 567, did not accept the Canons of Sardica, on which the whole system of papal appeals is based, for there is no provision for appeal beyond the metropolitan.

The Fifth General Council, at Constantinople, in 553, did not even so much as read the letter of Pope Vigilius, and condemned the "Three Chapters," despite the Pope's advocacy, and struck his name from the diptychs, or registers, of the Church—a virtual act of excommunication.

The Sixth General Council, 681, judged "that Honorius,

formerly Pope of Old Rome, be anathematized" . . . "Honorius the heretic."

The Roman Synod, of 963, deposed Pope John XII for simony and adultery and other grievous crimes.

The Synod of Sutri, in 1046, condemned Pope Sylvester III as an impostor, degraded him from holy orders, imprisoned him for life, and compelled the abdication of Benedict IX and Gregory VI, one of whom must have been the lawful claimant.

The Council of Pisa, in 1409, excommunicated Popes Benedict XIII and Gregory XII as schismatics, heretics, and perjurers, and crowned Alexander V.

The Council of Constance, which met in 1415, deposed Pope John XXIII. The counts were so scandalous that they were not published with the sentence. He is described as "an obstinate heretic," "a notorious simoniac," and as "a devil incarnate."

The Council of Basel, in 1439, declared Pope Eugenius IV deposed, and elected Pope Felix V.

These depositions of Popes are a revolution turning the papal autocracy into a church parliament. If the "Vicar of Christ" is the Head of the Church, the Church frequently committed suicide, cutting off its own head. (Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 91—124.)

5. If the official Canons and Decrees of the Councils do not reveal any "Vicar of Christ," *perhaps other acts of Councils and Fathers and others will show that some such exalted personage existed.*

Pope Anicetus, 157—168, tried to *persuade* Polycarp to keep Easter always on a Sunday. Failing in this, he did not condemn the opposition as a piece of insubordination, but conceded to Polycarp to celebrate the Eucharist. In this discussion Polycarp cited the example of St. John and the other Apostles. Anicetus does not say a word about Peter, or any privilege of his own office, but alleges merely the custom of the "elders" who preceded himself. Xystus, Telesphorus, Hy-

ginus, and Pius, the predecessors of Anicetus, had also been in communion with the Asiatic Christians, though these did not keep Easter on a Sunday.

Bishop Victor I of Rome, 193—202, in a domineering manner excommunicated the Asiatic churches who held to the tradition of St. John and insisted on keeping Easter on the day of the Jewish passover, the 14th day of Nisan. A large Synod at Ephesus under Polycrates rejected the demands of Victor. (Schick, p. 61.) Irenaeus and other bishops rebuked Victor, and used expressions handling him very severely, and called the Roman Popes "presbyters," and ignored Victor's excommunication. Eusebius, in the fourth century, sees in Victor's action nothing but a piece of undue intolerance. (Pul-ler, pp. 25—30.)

When Pope Victor, or his successor Zephyrinus, 202—219, allowed adulterers and fornicators to be restored to church fellowship after a light penance, Tertullian, deeply incensed in his moral earnestness, with bitter irony calls the Romish bishop by the name of his pagan colleague, Pontifex Maximus, and translates it into Episcopus Episcoporum, that is, one who sets himself up for an ecclesiastical despot. (Hase I, p. 218; Little-dale, *P. C.*, pp. 129. 130.)

Pope Callistus, 218—223, was accused by St. Hippolytus the martyr, Bishop of Portus (died about 250), of aiding heresy, of swindling depositors in a bank, of having been sentenced to scourging and to penal servitude in the mines, of having obtained church office by flattery, of being still a knave and an impostor, of having denied the Trinity, etc. He withdrew from Callistus and was consecrated as rival Pope of Rome, and yet met with no condemnation from the Church.

According to Doellinger's theory, in *Hippolytus and Callistus*, Christians in the third century, so far from regarding the Roman bishop as their master and teacher, troubled themselves very little to inquire who the bishop of Rome was.

Bishop Demetrius of Alexandria held two synods, 231 and 232, in which he deposed the celebrated Origen as pres-

byter and teacher, and excommunicated him, without saying a word to the Roman bishop. Later on Bishop Pontianus asked for the opinion of the Roman clergy, and they agreed with Demetrius. (Schick, p. 65.)

In 253 Bishop Fidus asked to have infant baptism forbidden. Sixty-six bishops met at Carthage and rejected the petition. And Cyprian, the Bishop of Carthage, was the president of the Synod, not the Bishop of Rome.

The Council of Carthage, in 255, rejected the letter of Pope Stephen, though enforced with a threat of excommunication, wherein he condemned the ruling of the Synod earlier in the year, insisting on the rebaptism of sectaries, while the Roman bishops admitted the validity of heretical baptisms.

The bishops of Leon and Merida, Basilides and Martial, sacrificed to idols, and Martial buried his child with heathen ceremonies; they confessed their sins and resigned; Bishop Stephen of Rome declared them still in office; the Spanish bishops appealed against this ruling to Bishop Cyprian of Carthage; thirty-seven bishops met there and reversed the sentence of Rome, in 270.

The main citations from Cyprian in favor of the Pope's supremacy are forgeries, as Beluze testifies. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 140.)

About the same time, Cyprian, presiding over eighty-seven bishops at a Council at Carthage, said: "No one of us sets himself up as Bishop of bishops or forces his colleagues to obedience by tyrannical terrorizing; for every Bishop in the free use of his liberty and power has his own right of judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he can himself judge another. But let us wait for the judgment of our universal Lord, Jesus Christ, who, singly and alone, has power to advance us in the government of His Church and to judge of our conduct." (*Our Brief*, p. 31; Puller, pp. 51—90.)

In Letter 74 Cyprian speaks of Pope Stephen's "error," his lies, his betrayal of the truth and faith, his haughtiness and ignorance.

St. Firmilian compares Stephen to Judas Iscariot, and censures his "audacity and insolence." "Thou art worse than all heretics." The bishops of Palestine write in the same strain. (Schick, p. 62.)

In this argument we have the first clear evidence of a Pope styling himself the successor of St. Peter, but yet no coupling with that of primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church as cause and effect.

When Pope Stephen, for the first time in recorded history, claims to be Peter's successor in Peter's own chair, St. Firmilian says of this boast, "I am justly indignant at such open and manifest folly in Stephen." (Puller, p. 84.)

When Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, was tried, in 264, St. Firmilian presided, the same whom Pope Stephen had excommunicated. That shows that no "Vicar of Christ" was recognized. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 141.)

Pope Pius II admitted that before the Nicene Council, in 325, very little regard was had to the Church of Rome. (E. G. Man, p. 104.)

In all the records preserved to us of the jealous suspicion with which the pagan State watched every detail of Christian usage, we find no trace of any "Vicar of Christ" ruling the Christians scattered in the wide Roman empire, such as the Jewish patriarch at Tiberias ruling all synagogues in the empire by his legates *a latere*.

The very existence of the Councils, parliaments of the Church, shows that there was no "Vicar of Christ" known to the people.

The Arian Council of Antioch, in 341, defied Pope Julius. He first claimed papal confirmation necessary to the reception of canons. Pope Innocent I, about sixty years later, rejected these canons, yet they were accepted *de facto*, and by the Council of Chalcedon *de jure*, and embodied in the code of the Roman Church itself. So, then, papal confirmation is not necessary to the reception of canons.

When Pope Julius I, 336—352, reproved some Eastern

bishops for calling a synod at Antioch without his permission, they laughed and told him Christianity arose in the East, and if there were any question of superiority, such belonged to the elder, Oriental, rather than to the younger, Western, branch. (Schick, p. 67.)

In 357 Pope Liberius signed the Arian creed of the Third Council of Sirmium, and Hilary of Poitiers writes, "Anathema to thee, renegade Liberius!"

When Damasus made a more decided bid for supremacy by telling the Bishop of Mauretania that all important questions must be settled by the Bishop of Rome, he was simply referred to the decrees of Nicaea.

Damasus, in 378, asked the Emperors Gratian and Valentinian to order that persons condemned by the Pope and refusing to submit should be tried by judges appointed by the Pope. This power is plainly by the grace of the Emperor, something new, not the privilege of Peter, centuries old.

The Second General Council, at Constantinople, in 381, was called by the Emperor Theodosius alone, and he alone ratified its actions. Meletius of Antioch, excommunicated by Rome, was the president of the Synod. Neither the Pope nor his legates were present. Pope Leo the Great rejected this Council. Forty years later Pope Felix omits Constantinople from the General Councils. Gelasius gives it no recognition; and yet it is reckoned as a true General Council by Popes Vigilius, Pelagius II, and Gregory the Great.

Bishop Gregory Nazianzen said in his concluding speech: "To thee, O Emperor, we owe what has been decided in this holy council. For at thy call we gathered here," etc.

When Theodosius, in 381, chose Nectarius to be Patriarch of Constantinople, the Italians complained about not having been consulted.

6. *Let us proceed patiently elsewhere to find the "Vicar of Christ."*

When the New Testament canon was fixed at Hippo, in 395, none of the Fathers dreamed of going to ask the Roman

Pope, the infallible teacher of the Church, the one man in all the world divinely qualified to decide what is canonical, what not. "What fools these mortals be!"

We read of the theological schools of Alexandria, of North Africa, of Asia Minor; we do not read of any Italian school.

Though Pope Innocent I, 402—417, refused communion with Atticus of Constantinople and Theophilus of Alexandria, the Eastern churches communed with them.

At the celebrated conference at Carthage, in 411, neither the 286 Catholic nor the 279 Donatist bishops have any inkling of the existence of any Pope with supreme authority in matters of doctrine and practice. (Schick, p. 59.)

Though Pope Felix III, 483—492, excommunicated Acaicius of Constantinople, the Eastern churches remained with the Greek and for some thirty years were not in communion with Rome.

"The bishops of Milan do not come to Rome for ordination," says Pope Pelagius, 555, and adds, "This was an ancient custom of theirs." This independence was finally extinguished by Nicholas II, in 1059. (E. G. Man, p. 193.)

The independence of Aquileja was not destroyed till the 11th century. (Schick, p. 68.)

Early in the seventh century the British bishops would have none of Rome's supremacy. (Schick, p. 34.)

At the Synod of Easterfield, in 702, Archbishop Brihtwald headed other bishops in the refusal to accept the Pope's sentence in favor of Wilfrid against Theodore. Wilfrid charged them with having opposed the Pope for twenty-two years. (*Ang. Br.*, p. 141.)

Gregory, who sent Augustine to England, defines the Church as "one flock under one Shepherd," and says: "All we are one in Christ Jesus—Himself being the *one* Shepherd." He does not claim a second shepherd on earth.

The bishops at the Council of Basel say: "The Church of Rome is not universal, but a part of the universal mystical

body of Christ, which is the Church, and so it is a member of Christ's body mystical as it appeareth by St. Gregory."

Justinian, in the fourth century, decreed that all believers in the Trinity were entitled to the name Catholic. (E. G. Man, pp. 104. 228.)

Charles the Great summoned councils and sat in them, examined and appointed bishops, settled by capitularies the smallest points of church discipline and polity. A synod at Frankfort, in 794, condemned the decrees of the Second Council, of Nicaea, which had been approved by Pope Hadrian, and without excluding images from churches, altogether forbade them to be worshiped or even venerated. He pressed Hadrian to declare Constantine VI a heretic for enouncing doctrines to which Hadrian had himself consented. In extant letters he lectures Pope Leo III in a tone of easy superiority, and admonishes him to obey the holy canons. Pope John VIII admitted and applauded the despotic superintendence of matters spiritual which Charles was wont to exercise, and which led some to give him playfully a title that had once been applied to the Pope himself, "*Episcopus Episcoporum*" (Bishop of bishops). (Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 70, 8th edition.)

Alcuin advised Charlemagne to send a work by Bishop Felix of East Anglia to Pope Leo III, 795—816, to Paulinus of Aquileja, to Theodore of Orleans, and to Richton of Triers. "If they agree in their arguments, that will be evidence of the truth of their conclusions. But if they do not agree, then that ought to stand valid which is most fully in accordance with the testimonies of Holy Scripture and of the ancient Fathers." (*Ang. Br.*, p. 140.) Evidently Alcuin knew nothing of an infallible Pope.

When Gregory IV, 827—844, went to France to excommunicate King Louis, the French bishops threatened him, "If he comes to ban, he shall return banned himself." (Schick, p. 65.)

Pope Formosus, 891—896, who had helped Arnulf of Carinthia to win the imperial crown, had to pay for this treason

after death; his successor had his body dug up, sentenced by a synod, cut off the finger used in blessing, and thrown naked into the Tiber.

On July 16, 1054 the papal legates placed on the main altar of St. Sophia the excommunication of Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople. That worthy promptly returned the compliment by excommunicating his brother at Rome.

Pope Alexander II blessed William the Norman, 1066, in his design to dispose of the offices and revenues of the English Church in order to punish the English clergy for their independence, according to Prof. Freeman. (*Ang. Br.*, p. 156.) When Pope Gregory VII demanded the arrears in Peter-pence and homage for the crown of England, William proudly and defiantly replied, "I do not find that my predecessors professed it to yours." For some time he refused to allow Archbishop Lanfranc and Archbishop Thomas of York to go to Rome to get the pallium, nor would he permit papal letters to be published in England without his express approval. (l. c., p. 158.)

In 1076 a Council at Winchester absolutely refused to comply with the imperious demand of Gregory VII that the clergy abstain from marriage. (l. c., p. 141.)

Greatly irritated by Lanfranc's allegiance to William the Conqueror, Gregory VII wrote an angry letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1081, imperiously summoning him to Rome within a given time under all manner of ecclesiastical threats. Lanfranc took little notice of Hidebrand and quietly went about his business. (l. c., pp. 161—163.)

Anselm of Canterbury refused to submit to Guido, Archbishop of Vienna, the Papal Legate. (l. c., p. 257.)

In order to protect England from papal aggression, King Henry II, on January 25, 1164, called a council and passed the Constitutions of Clarendon. (l. c., p. 215.)

It is said that nineteen Bishops of St. David's, before Henry I, 1100—1135, and no Irish Bishops before 1151, applied to Rome for a pall. (l. c., pp. 131. 150.)

During the absence of about ten years of Richard I,

1189—1199, the Pope had his way in England, and the result was so disastrous that on his return the King remorsefully cried out, "How shall we answer for these things at the Great Day of Account?" He appointed secular Canons who "will enable us to resist the thieves of Rome." (l. c., p. 219.)

In 1215 the Barons forced King John Lackland to sign Magna Charta and braved the excommunication of the mighty Pope Innocent III.

In 1231 Sir Robert Twenge, a Yorkshire knight, organized a secret society to oppose papal usurpations and extortions.

In 1244 the Barons ordered the Papal Nuncio to leave England at the risk of his life, because of the Pope's execrable extortions, and King Henry III was unable to give him a safe-conduct.

In 1240 the clergy of Berkshire published that other Churches are not liable to pay tax or tribute to Rome; that Christ gave no power to the Pope to exact large sums of money in the execution of spiritual offices; that the Pope, when he first asked for a contribution, promised not to repeat the request, and that if a second contribution were made to him, as he desired, there was danger of its being drawn into an annual and slavish precedent. (l. c., p. 141.)

In 1253 Boniface of Canterbury burned the papal bull which forbade him to interfere with the monastery of St. Augustine in his own city.

In 1256 Sewal de Boville became Archbishop of York and told Pope Alexander IV that St. Peter was to feed our Lord's sheep, not to flay and eat them. (l. c., p. 258.)

The Parliament at Lincoln, in January, 1301, sent a unanimously signed remonstrance to Boniface VIII, repudiating his jurisdiction "in any temporal matter whatsoever." (l. c., p. 254.)

In 1307 the Parliament of Carlisle passed the first Anti-Papal Statute, limiting the exactions of the Papal Procurator. (l. c., p. 244.)

From the beginning of the reign of Edward III, 1327,

to the end of Richard II, there was much anti-papal legislation, which culminated in the famous Statute of Praemunire, 1392, which denied the Pope's jurisdiction over the English Church. (l. c., p. 269.) Under Henry IV and Henry V the same war on the Pope went on. (l. c., pp. 270—280.)

In 1414 the University of Oxford protested against the simony of John XXIII. (l. c., p. 281.)

Before any rupture with Rome, and according to existing laws, Henry VIII deposed Cardinal Wolsey, and for violating Praemunire the clergy were fined some \$5,000,000. While still in communion with Rome, England abolished the Papal Supremacy and affirmed the Royal Supremacy, in 1534. (l. c., pp. 284—288.)

"For the first thousand years of church history not a question of doctrine was finally decided by the Pope. The Roman Bishops *took no part* in the commotions which the numerous Gnostic sects, the Montanists and the Chiliasts, produced in the early Church; nor can a single dogmatic decree, issued by one of them, be found during the first four centuries, nor a trace of the existence of any." (Janus, pp. 64. 65.)

"That very late invention, that Bishops receive their jurisdiction from the Pope, and are, as it were, his vicars, ought to be banished from Christian schools, as unheard for twelve centuries," writes "the Eagle of Meaux," the Roman Catholic Bossuet. (*Defens. Decl. Cleri Gall.* VIII, p. 14. Littledale, p. 241.)

It is not till the twelfth century that the decrees of any synod are issued in the name of the president only, even if Pope, but in the name of all the Bishops present, as exercising collective and co-equal authority, as is stated by the Catholic Van Espen. No act or canon of any synod whatever bestows direct authority on the Roman Pope till that of the Lateran in 1215. (Littledale, *P. R.*, p. 238.)

No charge of heresy can be found to have been brought against any one in the ancient Church for denying or resisting the Pope's authority. On the other hand, some of those who

resisted it most steadily are amongst the most famous saints, as St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, and St. Hilary of Arles. (l. c., p. 239.)

Titles of great honor were bestowed upon St. Peter, but so were they upon others of the Apostles; so that does not prove Peter's supremacy. Moreover, the titles of greatest honor were given to Peter by the Eastern Church, which never admitted any supremacy on the part of the Popes of Rome. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 90.)

The Greek Fathers at the Council at Florence very properly said that inferences must not be drawn from titles of honor. (Schick, p. 29.)

No reference to papal authority can be found in any creed, or in any gloss on any creed, till the Creed of Pope Pius IV in 1564. (Littledale, p. 239.)

At his ordination every Roman priest swears to this creed, where you find these words concerning the Scriptures: "Neither will I take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." But there is no unanimous consent of all the Fathers in favor of Peter being the "rock."

According to the VII Epistle of the Roman Catholic Lounoi, in 1731, seventeen Fathers say so; but forty-four say it is the *faith* Peter confessed; sixteen say it is *Christ Himself*; eight say it is *all* the Apostles. (Littledale, *P. C.*, 73—80; Salmon, *Inf.*, p. 335.)

Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis, at the Vatican Council in 1870, in a speech to be delivered, but not delivered, yet printed at Naples, shows the same and goes on: "If we are bound to follow the majority of the Fathers in this thing, then we are bound to hold for certain that by the 'rock' should be understood the faith professed by Peter, not Peter who professed the faith."—"The primacy of the Roman pontiff, both in honor and jurisdiction, I acknowledge, primacy, I say, not lordship." He accepted the primacy as based on tradition. "But that it can be proved from the words of Holy Scripture

I deny. It is true, I held the opposite view when writing the *Observations*, but on closer study of the subject, I judge this interpretation must be abandoned." (Grafton, *Corr.*, p. 74; *Our Brief*, pp. 17—19; McKim, p. 46.)

The first father whom Allnatt in his *Cathedra Petri* can quote for this claim is Pope Siricius, in 386. None of the Greek Fathers of the first six centuries connects the position of the Bishop of Rome with the promise to St. Peter. (Gore, *R. C. C.*, p. 91.)

Janus writes (p. 91): "Of all the Fathers who have exegetically explained these passages in the Gospels (Matt. 16, 18; John 21, 17) *not a single one applies them to the Roman Bishops as Peter's successors*. How many Fathers have busied themselves with these texts, yet not one of them whose commentaries we possess — Origen, Chrysostom, Hilary, Augustine, Cyril, Theodoret, and those whose interpretations are collected in catenas — has dropped the faintest hint that the primacy of Rome is the consequence of the commission and promise to Peter! Not one of them has explained the rock or foundation on which Christ would build His Church of the office given to Peter to be transmitted to his successors, but they understood by it either Christ Himself, or Peter's confession of faith in Christ; often both together. Or else they thought Peter was the foundation equally with all the other Apostles, the Twelve being together the foundation-stones of the Church (Rev. 21, 14)." — Page 92 he writes: "Every one knows that the one classical passage of Scripture on which the edifice of Papal Infallibility has been reared is the saying of Christ to Peter: 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, confirm [strengthen] thy brethren.' But these words manifestly refer only to Peter personally, to his denial of Christ and his conversion. . . . It is directly against the sense of the passage, which speaks simply of faith . . . to find in it a promise of future infallibility to a succession of Popes, just because they hold the office Peter first held in the Roman church. No single writer to the end of

the seventh century dreamt of such an interpretation; all without exception—and there are eighteen of them—explain it simply as a prayer of Christ that His Apostle might not wholly succumb, and lose his faith entirely in his approaching trial. The first to find in it a promise of privilege to the Church of Rome was Pope Agatho in 680, when trying to avert the threatened condemnation of his predecessor, Honorius, through whom the Roman church had lost its boasted privilege of doctrinal purity.”

“The flower of Roman Catholic learning,” as Ambassador James Bryce calls Doellinger, writes: “For thirteen centuries an incomprehensible silence on this fundamental article reigned throughout the whole Church and her literature. None of the ancient confessions of faith, no catechism, none of the patristic writings composed for the instruction of the people, contain a syllable about the Pope, still less any hint that all certainty of faith and doctrine depends on him.” (Janus, p. 64.) Even Cardinal Hergenroether in his *Irrthümer*, p. 4, calls Doellinger an “ornament and pillar of the Catholic Church of Germany.”

Bishop Strossmeyer said at the Vatican Council, “If Simon, Son of Jona, was what we believe His Holiness, Pius IX, to be to-day, it is wonderful He had not said to him, ‘When I have ascended to my Father, you shall obey Simon Peter as you obey me. I establish him my vicar on earth’—certainly if He had wished that it would be so, He would have said it. What do you conclude from His silence? Logic tells us that Christ did not wish to make St. Peter head of the apostolic company. Permit me to repeat it! If He had wished to constitute Peter His vicar, He would have given him chief command of His spiritual army. The Apostle Paul makes no mention in any of his letters directed to the various churches of the Primacy of Peter. If this primacy had existed, he would have written a long letter on this all-important subject. Neither in the writings of St. Paul, St. John, or St. James have I found a trace or germ of the papal power. I have sought for

a pope in the first four centuries and I have not found him." (*Bible Student and Teacher*, Febr., 1908.)

"I conclude victoriously, with History, with Reason, with Logic, with Good Sense, and with a Christian Conscience, that Jesus Christ did not confer any supremacy on St. Peter, and that the Bishops of Rome did not become Sovereigns of the Church, but only by confiscating, one by one, all the rights of the Episcopate." (McKim, p. 47.)

IV.

Suppose Peter had been the lord of the Apostles and of the whole Church and had desired to give his lordship to his successor, have we any evidence of its regular transmission through a legitimate succession? Did the "mystic oil" come through the "golden pipes" of the two hundred and sixty odd popes down these two thousand years from Peter to Pius X?

1. *A doubtful Pope no Pope.*

a. Cabassute, the papal historian of the Councils, says, "It is very doubtful as to whether Linus, Cletus, or Clement succeeded Peter."

Very good; Cardinal Bellarmine says, "A doubtful Pope is no Pope." (*De Conc.* II, ch. 19, sect. XIX.)

The *Liber Pontificalis*, supposed to have been written by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, purports to give the lives of the Popes from Peter to Nicholas I; but Ciampini, in a critical essay in 1688, rejects all but five of the lives as not being written by Anastasius at all, but by several unknown authors, of whose worth we have no means of judging; and from the work of Marini on the Vatican archives it appears that no light can be gotten on this important subject. (Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 304—306.)

Duchesne, who held the Chair of Church History at the Paris School of Theology (1878—1895), had at once the learning of Neander and the irony of Voltaire. His *Etude sur le Liber Pontificalis* (1877), saved with difficulty from the *Index*, demonstrated the presence of fable in the records of the earliest period of the Christian community at Rome. He

refrained from drawing the theological conclusions indicated by his historical criticism. But these could not fail to suggest themselves to his pupils. (Alfred Fawkes in *Hibbert Journal*, Oct., 1909.)

b. Gratian cites a decree by Pope Nicholas II: "If any one be enthroned in the Apostolic See without accordant and canonical election by the Cardinals of the said Church, and thereafter by the religious clergy of lower grade, let him be accounted not Pope or Apostolic, but Apostate."

That is plain and fair. But the Count of Tusculum forcibly imposed Pope Benedict X without any election by the Roman clergy or people. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 309.)

On the death of Honorius II, in 1130, sixteen Cardinals concealed the fact and secretly elected Cardinal Gregory Guidone as Innocent II. The other thirty-two Cardinals then elected Cardinal Peter Leonis as Anacletus II, and both were consecrated the same day. St. Bernard got Emperor Lothar II to put Innocent into possession with the force of the army. This is another defect in the Pope's title.

On the death of Hadrian IV, in 1159, Alexander III had fourteen votes, Victor IV nine, yet the Council of Pavia, in 1160, decided in favor of Victor, probably because he recognized the Council and Alexander refused to do so. From Novatian, in 251, till Nicholas V, in 1328, there were thirty-nine anti-popes.

c. Again, the Canon Law says: "By violent entry upon possession of a benefice every one loses, through that very act, the right he has thereto, and it becomes legally vacant."

Very good. In 366 Pope Damasus went to the Papal chair through violent rioting and shedding of blood, and thereby certainly forfeited his right, which had been very uncertain before.

d. Pope Benedict XIV says, "No one who is not Bishop of Rome can be styled Successor of Peter," and the Councils from Nicaea I to Trent and the Bull of Pius IV, *In Suprema Ecclesiae Specula*, compel every Bishop to a *personal* residence

in his see, under pain of deprivation. During the seventy years of the "Babylonian Captivity" at Avignon, from 1309—1379, the See of Rome was thereby void.

e. On the death of Pope Gregory XI, in 1378, at Rome, the Cardinals, surrounded by a violent mob, threatening to tear them in pieces and set the house on fire over their heads if they elected a foreign pope, chose an Italian, Urban VI, and notified his election, as usual, to the courts of Europe. When Urban VI began to reform abuses, the French Cardinals set up the plea of constraint and said the Pope, "forgetful of his salvation, and burning with ambition, had allowed himself to be enthroned and crowned; and assumed the name of Pope, though he rather merited that of apostate and Antichrist." They set up Clement VII.

During the Great Schism, from 1378 till 1417, there were two, sometimes three, lines of rival Popes, every one of them cursing every one else as the Antichrist. Who was the true Pope at any given time? St. Catherine of Siena held to the Italian succession; St. Vincent Ferrer to the competing line; St. Antoninus of Florence said the question cannot be settled now; Cardinal Bellarmine says, "A doubtful Pope is no Pope"! (Littledale, *P. R.*, p. 194.)

For a whole generation no man knew whether the Papacy was in Italy or in France. (Lord Acton, *Lect. Mod. Hist.*, p. 91.)

The Jesuit Maimbourg says that even a general council, which had the aid of the Holy Ghost, did not venture to decide which of the Popes was the true one, deposed them all, and set up a new one of its own. (Salmon, *Inf.*, p. 396.)

The Council of Pisa deposed both Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, and elected Alexander V in their place.

Pisa is rejected by the Ultramontanes as irregular. But the title of John XXIII rests on Pisa, and he called the Council of Constance, so that, too, then, is irregular. And that means in law that there was no true Pope after the death of Gregory XI in 1378, and therefore no validly ordained bishops and priests, and no true sacraments!

The Council of Constance deposed and imprisoned Pope John XXIII, disestablished Popes Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, thus rejecting both lines of Popes, and elected Otto Colonna as Pope Martin V. But only one living Cardinal had been created before the death of Gregory XI, and he was that very Peter de Luna who claimed to be Benedict XIII, and refused to acknowledge the right of the Council to question his title, inasmuch as the submission of his two rivals, Gregory XII and John XXIII, left him the only possible valid Pope.

Thus all the votes cast for Martin V by the twenty-three titular Cardinals and the thirty electors chosen by the Council were void. The Pope could not be elected by Cardinals who had no right to vote; if the Pope was elected by the conciliar electors, then they created a wholly new papacy, tracing its origin not to St. Peter, but to the Council of Constance.

A Catholic historian says it belongs to the mysteries of the Curia that it neither recognizes nor overthrows the resolutions of Constance as to the supremacy of the general council over the Pope. It does not recognize it, for it sets up a power superior to the Papacy. It does not overthrow it, for by virtue of this resolution Martin V was elected at Constance. Upon the legitimacy of this election, and of the cardinals named by this Pope, rests the legitimacy of the whole papal elective dynasty since that date. (Hase I, p. 269.)

The Pope's secretary Coluccio Salutato thought that as all church jurisdiction is derived from the Pope, and as a Pope invalidly elected cannot give what he does not himself possess, no bishops or priests ordained since the death of Gregory XI could guarantee the validity of the sacraments they administered. It followed, according to him, that any one who adored the Eucharist consecrated by a priest ordained in schism worshipped an idol. To Jodocus, Margrave of Brandenburg, in 1398. (Janus, p. 295; Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 335.)

2. A heretical Pope no Pope.

Pope Innocent III admitted, "I can be judged by the Church for that sin only which is committed against the Faith."

(Serm. 2 *De Consecrat. Pontif.*) F. Ryder (*Contemp. Review*, Febr., 1879, p. 471) says that the Pope, by manifest heresy, *ipso facto*, ceases to be Pope. St. Raymond de Penaforte says, "Every heretic, secret or manifest, incurs deposition, be he Pope or Emperor." Pope Paul IV in his formidable Bull *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, of 1559, says, that if at any time whatsoever it appear that even the Roman Pontiff, before his promotion to be Cardinal or Pope, have erred from the Catholic faith, his election and all his acts are at once null and void. This Bull is *ex cathedra*, binding on the Church.

a. Pope Liberius, in 357, signed an Arian creed and condemned Athanasius, and for this St. Hilary of Poitiers exclaims, "I say Anathema to thee, renegade Liberius!"

b. Pope Honorius taught the heresy of monothelism in his *ex cathedra* letters, and these were condemned as "most impious" by Pope Martin I in the First Lateran Council, in 649, and it was as "dogmatic epistles" that they were condemned by the Sixth General Council, and ordered to be burned as profane and hurtful to souls—the first example in church history of this kind of sentence. Pope Leo II condemned Honorius anew in a letter to Emperor Const. Pogonatus; damned him eternally in a letter to the Spaniard Bishops, and in a letter to Erwig, King of Spain.

Pope Gregory II is believed to have drafted the profession of faith in the *Liber Diurnus* in which for many centuries every Pope condemned Honorius to perpetual anathema for the heresy of monothelism.

c. The *Capitale* of Rome, February 18, 1876, brings proof that Pope Pius IX was admitted in his youth as a Freemason and thereby incurred the penalty of excommunication and the anathemas of Clement XII and Benedict XIV.

According to Roman principles, then, there is no warrant for a valid election at any time, no certainty that the wearer of the tiara is Pope at all. (Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 312—315; *P. R.*, pp. 245. 246.)

d. Emperor Ludwig the Pious, in 826, appointed the most

learned clergy of France to make a formal inquiry into the whole question of image-worship, and they formally censured the letter of Pope Hadrian I to Constantine VI and Irene in behalf of image-worship, also the letters of Pope Gregory II, and called it a "pestilent superstition." (Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 321—324.)

e. Bishop Formosus of Portus was excommunicated by two synods under Pope John VIII and compelled to swear never to return to Rome. The next Pope, Marinus, restored him to his see. Later, Formosus was elected Pope and forced from the altar the previously elected Sergius, and held the chair for five years. After the fifteen days of Pope Boniface VII, Pope Stephen VI dug up the corpse of Formosus, dressed it in the pontifical robes, and put it on trial before a synod for the crime of usurping the Popedom. The corpse was condemned, stripped of its robes, three fingers cut off from the hand, flung into the Tiber, and all ordinations declared null and void. Pope Stephen VI was soon after strangled in prison, and his successor, Pope Romanus, annulled all the acts of Stephen, so did Pope Theodore II, and buried the body of Formosus in the Vatican. Pope John IX had a synod formally annul the acts of the synod under Stephen VI, and ordered them to be burned, and all partakers therein had to plead for pardon.

Now, then, Who's who and what's what in Rome about this time?

3. *An unlawful Pope no Pope.*

Pope Leo V, a few weeks after his enthronement in 903, was thrown into prison by a priest, Christopher, who forced himself into the Papacy. He was, in turn, overthrown by Sergius III, who forced himself into the papal chair; his character is painted in the blackest colors by the historians of the time. Under his auspices the infamous triad of courtesans, the two Theodoras and Marozia, obtained the influence which enabled them to dispose the papal crown several times, to Anastasius III, Laudo, John X, Leo VI, Stephen VII,

John XI, Leo VII, Stephen VIII, Martin III, Agapetus II, and John XII, a mere boy, deposed for atrocious crimes by a synod under Otto I in 963.

The Roman Catholic historian Baronius says (*Ann.* 912, VIII): "What was, then, the aspect of the holy Roman Church? How utterly foul, when harlots, at once most powerful and most vile, bore rule at Rome; at whose will sees were exchanged, bishops appointed, and what is awful and horrible to hear, their paramours were intruded as pseudo-Popes into the See of Peter, who are not set down in the catalogue of the Roman pontiffs, except for the purpose of fixing the dates. For who could assert that persons lawlessly intruded by such courtesans were legitimate pontiffs? There is no mention anywhere of the clergy electing or subsequently assenting. All the canons were thrust down into silence, the decrees of Popes were strangled, the old traditions were banned, the ancient customs, the sacred rites, and the early usages in the election of the Supreme Pontiff were completely annulled. And what sort of cardinals, deacons, and priests do you suppose were chosen by these monsters?" (*Annal. Eccles. An.* 912, tom. X, p. 697, Antv. 1603; quoted in *Pope Joan*, p. 31.)

Gilbert Genebrard, Archbishop of Aix (1537—1597), in his *Chronologia Sacra*, alleges that fifty Popes in 150 years—that is nearly one-fifth of the total number—were apostates rather than apostolic.

Now, then, holiness is one of the five Notes of the Church; the Pope is really the whole Church, the soul and life of the Church; if the Popes are so often and so enormously wicked, what is the result?

If any Petrine succession or privilege ever existed in the Roman church, it was extinguished irrecoverably at the close of this period, extending over sixty years, during which there was not one lawfully elected Pope. Many of them sold dignities, none could lawfully appoint to any office. After sixty years' anarchy no one qualified to elect a Pope was left; therefore the election, in 963, of Leo VIII or of Benedict V (which-

ever be held the true Pope) was void. The Petrine line, if ever a reality, died out in the tenth century.

4. *A simoniacal Pope no Pope.*

In the bull *Cum tum divino*, of Pope Julius II (1503 to 1513), it is said: "Whosoever procures the suffrage of any Cardinal by promises, obligations, or contract made by himself or another, though his election be made by the unanimous vote of the whole College of Cardinals, and even confirmed by adoration, it is nevertheless void and of no effect, and the person so tainted with simoniacal heresy is to be accounted no Pope or Bishop of Rome, but an apostate and arch-heretic." (B. Willard-Archer, p. 40.)

Gammarus, Auditor of the Rota, in his commentary on this bull, alleges it to be so worded as to be retrospective in effect, fully voiding all such former elections. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 311.)

From Jerome's epistles we know that greed of money was a crying sin of the Roman clergy even in his day, so that it had to be dealt with by the civil authorities. Soon simony became habitual and the Roman Senate decreed: "If anything have been given or promised either by the individual himself or by an intermediary for the purpose of obtaining the bishopric, the contract shall be void, and whatever may have been so given shall be restored." (B. Willard-Archer, p. 39.)

Boniface II became Pope through bribery; on his death, in 532, John II became Pope through bribery. King Athalaric wrote, on the authority of the Advocate of the Roman Church, that not only were the poor funds used for this purpose, but even the sacred altar vessels were knocked down to the highest bidder to procure funds for bribery. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 289.)

In the eleventh century Benedict VIII, John XIX, Benedict IX, and Gregory VI gained the Papacy by bribery. Gregory VI was opposed by Benedict and two other anti-Popes and was deposed for simony by the Council of Sutri in 1046. Thus another canonical vacancy of thirty-four years in the Papacy was caused. Without the former gap of sixty years, this

would be enough to cast the gravest doubt on the status of the Roman electorate which elected Clement II in 1046, for only a very few could have been appointed before the simoniacal intrusion of Benedict VIII in 1012. And according to Bishop Bonizo of Sutri, thirty years later, the Germans charged the local Roman clergy with being, almost to a man, either illiterate, simoniac, or immoral. The second count of the indictment is amply borne out by the vain attempts to check the crime of simony at the Synod of Rome in 1047, and by the indignant language of the Abbot of Monte Cassino, later Pope Victor III.

That the Bishop of Rome had no universal jurisdiction is very clear from the simple fact that for the first thousand years his election was a purely local affair.

In order to avoid the rioting and bribery which had so often disgraced the election of a Pope, Nicholas II, in 1059, transferred the election of the Pope from the Roman clergy and people to the College of Cardinals. In 1179, Alexander III made an election by two-thirds of the Cardinals valid. It was not till the election of Lucius III, in 1181, that the new regulation was carried out.

Cardinal della Rovere, nephew of a former Pope, himself Pope Julius II later on, armed with the secrets of the Conclave, insisted that Alexander VI be deposed for having bought the papacy with money and money's worth. (Acton, *Lect. Mod. Hist.*, p. 38.)

There had been no hypocrisy in the transaction; and all Europe was able to learn the exact sums that had been paid, or promised, to his supporters, and even to their attendants. (Acton, *Hist. Essays*, p. 67.)

Pope Julius II tried to free the Church from the responsibility of the acts of Pope Alexander VI; and Luther assailed the system completed by Alexander VI. (l. c., p. 67.)

One of the Popes wrote that he had been raised to the papal throne in place of three others deposed for bribery. (l. c., p. 438.)

Pope Innocent VIII was elected by simony in 1484, and his successor, the infamous Cardinal Roderic de Borgia, was elected in 1492 by a majority of twenty-two out of the twenty-seven Cardinals, whose votes had been bought by Cardinal Ascanio Sforza, as recorded by Von Eggs, the Roman Catholic historian. As Pope Alexander VI, Borgia openly sold the cardinalate to the highest bidders, so that his own popedom and their cardinalate were all void by reason of simony. Pope Julius II was elected in 1503 in a conclave of thirty-seven Cardinals, of whom twenty-six were of Alexander VI's invalid creation, while the same Cardinal Sforza managed the election with the same bribery as the previous one. Pope Leo X was elected, in 1513, by Cardinals, none of whom were competent to elect, since all of them were created either by Alexander VI or Julius II. Pope Leo X sold the cardinalate to the highest bidders, as Alexander VI had done. Pope Clement VII was elected by bribery in 1523. So no conceivably valid election of a Pope has taken place since that of Sixtus IV in 1471, even if every defect before that be condoned.

5. *A lack-of-"intention" Pope no Pope.*

Suppose we grant, for the sake of argument, that Peter was the Prince; that he gave his supremacy to his successor; that there was no break in the succession all these two thousand years; that there was no heresy in any of the popes; that there was no bribery in the election of any single one: what then? Would the Pope's claim to be the Vicar of Christ then be well grounded?

By no means! Listen to the Council of Trent: "If any one shall say that in ministers, while they form and give the sacraments, *intention* is not required, at least of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema." (Sess. VII, can. 11.)

This was strongly opposed by the Bishop of Minori: "The Bishop thought they ought to consider what grief of mind it would occasion a father of tender feeling towards a dying son, if it occurred to him to doubt the intention of the priest who was baptizing his child," setting forth also the effect of a

baptism without intention as invalidating the confirmation, communion, and ordination of the child if it should become a man, a priest, and a bishop, with all rites which such a bishop might perform. (Dearden, p. 300.)

Some tried to relieve this terrible teaching by saying the intention to perform the outward ceremony is enough; but Alexander VIII, in 1680, condemned this relief opinion. When it was urged that it is against God's justice that a penitent sinner should "be damned through the malice of a priest," Ferraris can merely say, "that they are damned for their sin, actual or original; God has duly provided the means for their salvation, and is not bound, even if He could, to prevent the malice of His ministers." And Addis' Catholic Dictionary says, "It is quite true that the majority of school theologians believe that secret withholding of the intention is enough to invalidate the sacrament." A Romish priest in *Historical Papers*, p. 5, says the persecution of the Spanish Inquisition produced "a class of Jews who were such at heart, although by open profession they had become Christians. . . . Not a few of these secret Jews had risen to high ecclesiastical dignities, some even to bishoprics."

What follows from this?

Cardinal Bellarmine says, "No one can be certain, with the certainty of faith, that he receives a true sacrament, because the sacrament cannot be valid without the intention of the minister, *and no man can see another's intention.*" (Littledale, p. 22.)

What follows from this? For lack of intention on the part of a baptizing priest the boy is never baptized; the boy, when grown, enters the Church, but he never becomes a priest, and every priestly act of his is null and void; those he ordains are no more priests than himself; all their acts are not valid; he becomes Pope, but lacks the infallibility, and so the Church loses her head and becomes a corpse. On his own principles no Romanist can say with certainty that there is a true catholic and apostolic Church on the earth to-day.

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

LUTHERANISM IN AMERICA: ITS GLORY AND ITS MISSION.¹⁾

The event which forms the historical basis of the present celebration, and, if necessary, furnishes the moral reason for it, lies at a remote distance from us, as regards both time and place. In our day the event is studied, as a rule, merely in the magnitude of its consequences. We are like men standing at a point near the estuary of the majestic river which drains the great central basin of our country: we see an immense body of water rushing past us, bearing on its bosom the commerce of many cities, supplying the energy for the industries of many towns, and determining the character of the agriculture of vast tracts of land. If our eye could sweep from the Eads Jetties to Lake Itasca, and beyond; if in one comprehensive vista we could embrace both the enormous mouth and the tiny source of the great river, — would our admiration be lessened because of the tiny source? I take it, the very opposite would occur. A feeble beginning only serves to render more intense and more cordial our appreciation of great results which have sprung from it.

Let us leave for a while our present social environments; let us step outside of our political institutions; let us forget our present religious status; and from our present point of observation in twentieth century North America let us ascend to the headwaters of the reformatory movement. We are transferred to a sixteenth century border town in Saxony. Yonder stands a little dilapidated church. A handful of people going to morning mass on All Saints' Day find a parchment on the church-door posted by one of the Augustinian friars of the town. It is in Latin, and many pass by without reading it. Others read it, and shrug their shoulders. A few grow thought-

1) Delivered at a joint celebration of the anniversary of the Reformation by the Lutheran congregations of the Synodical Conference in New York City at Cooper Union Hall, October 31, 1909, and published by request of the New York City Conference.

ful, exchange remarks more or less favorable to the views set forth in the document, and join the worshippers inside. That is all. There is no excitement, no demonstration. And if we were to look in at the cell of Brother Martinus, the author of the document, we should behold a very plain, unpretentious man, small of stature, of serious mien, but with no outward criterion to indicate to us the heroic courage, or to portend the startling achievements which have made the name of Luther a household word in both hemispheres, and raised the last day in October, 1517, to the dignity of one of the few truly great days in the life of the race.

A modern historian has said: "Had there been no Luther, the English, American, and German peoples would be thinking differently, would be acting differently, would be altogether different men and women from what they are at this moment." And a modern poet and divine has voiced this kindred sentiment: "How would Christendom have fared without a Luther? What would Rome have done and dared but for the ocean of the reformed that bounds her? Luther lives yet—not so beneficially in the Lutheran Church as out of it—an antagonistic spirit to Rome, and a purifying and preserving spirit to Christendom at large." These are great assertions, and they are the more welcome because they were made by parties who are outside of the Lutheran Church, and hence cannot be suspected of bias friendly to our church. One of them even questions whether the work of Luther has attained its just measure of appreciation within the church that was named after the Reformer. These assertions credit this one man Luther and his deed with the impulse which has started the nations now marching in the van of civilization on their career of progress; they trace the religious, moral, intellectual, social, political advancement of the age in which we are living to the valor of the one act which at Rome they called "a cloister-brawl of German buffoons."

Imagine someone telling Luther that all this would come of his Wittenberg Theses: in his honest, sober way he would

have scrutinized the speaker with that peculiar look which questions a person's mental balance.

When Luther began his life-work, Europe was agog with excitement on account of the new continent that had been re-discovered in the far West. America was, to the European nations, just nineteen years and a few days old when Luther challenged Tetzels. Four years later the first American natives were seen on European soil and exhibited to Charles V at Worms. Now, imagine someone telling Luther that it would be here, in this savage country, that his labors would bear their richest fruit; that out of the trackless forests and the pathless prairies of the mysterious land that was said to be lying toward the setting sun there would rise, within four centuries, a church that would cherish his teaching with greater fervor than they would be cherished in the land of his birth; that a time would come, when in the country where the voice of the living Luther had been ringing his name and remembrance as a religious teacher would be largely dropped, and his authority as a correct expounder of Scripture would be generally set aside, by the nation for which he toiled, and that then there would be two and a half million men, women, and children in North America who would not be ashamed to call themselves Lutherans; that the beginning of the twentieth century would behold on American soil a Lutheran clergy with over 8000 names on their roster, ministering to over 13,000 Lutheran congregations; that this American Lutheran Church would conduct over one hundred schools of higher education, — seminaries, colleges, academies, — with nearly one thousand teachers and over fifteen thousand students; would dispense charity in over one hundred orphans' homes, hospitals, hospices, etc.; that the periodical press of this church alone would number nearly two hundred church-papers; and, what is best of all, that the two great principles of the pure Christian religion, which he had championed against the combined forces of an apostate church, and paganized universities, and a hireling autoeracy, would here be upheld, with rare exceptions, by a loyal laity and clergy, even at the risk

of incurring the dreaded censure of the universities of Luther's own land. Imagine, I say, someone telling Luther all this: no doubt, the humble preacher, whose words in the course of events shook the foundations of the Roman hierarchy, would have smiled incredulously at such information, and in his heart of hearts he would have set his informant down as a "Schwaermer."

In the greatness of Luther and his work this, I take it, is the grandest and most endearing feature: the simplicity, the utter lack of ambition, the uncalculating conscientiousness, with which he set about doing what his pastoral duty required of him. Consider how it all happened. Here is a confessor to whom men come with their burdened hearts, and he counsels them, as the desert preacher fifteen hundred years before him had counseled the multitudes on the banks of the Jordan. He speaks kindly to them as the Christ had done to the weary and heavy-laden. While thus pursuing the even tenor of his pastoral calling, there rolls into his path a monstrous engine of oppression and extortion, in the form of an indulgence monger. It threatens to arrest and to crush his pastoral activity. Luther is placed before the alternative of either removing the monster or resigning his charge. He is called upon to decide this question: In this business of the forgiveness of sin, who is right — am I, or is this fellow Tetzl? A fearful conflict of authorities is looming up before him. As yet Luther is not conscious of the real identity of his opponent. He imagines that he is correcting a set of sacrilegious monks. He is not aware that he has risen against the highest ecclesiastical authority at that time. Luther is such a simple-hearted, unsuspecting, undesigning, artless person, that he sits down to write the Holy Father at Rome an earnest letter, to inform him that religious scoundrels are committing all manner of irreligious nuisances in his holy name. And he expects that the Holy Father will at once cashier Tetzl. It was not until he had met the supercilious Eck, and the haughty Cardinal of Gaeta, and the smooth-tongued Miltitz, that Luther's vision became clear; and then

there were moments when he himself would stand aghast at the magnitude of the conflict which he had conjured up.

They have charged Luther with ambition, rebellion, apostasy. They do not know Luther. This unsophisticated recluse shunned nothing more than worldly fame and secular glory. He was naturally a timid, shrinking man. What brought him into the arena of public strife was the call of duty; and what turned this meek man into a bold lion was, because the truth of God's Word and the genuineness of his Redeemer's pardoning grace were assailed. In the defense of these treasures, which he had learned to prize, the pale scholar, worn and wan with many a vigil, much fasting, and exacting study, would rise in solemn earnestness; and as he spoke he would seem to grow tall, giant-like, towering above the barking rabble at his feet.

Face thine enemies, accusers;
Scorn the prison, rack, or rod;
And if thou hast truth to utter,
Speak! and leave the rest with God,—

this rugged sentiment would then seem to speak from every line of his radiant, upturned face.

Luther's testimony startled the world in his day. Within an incredibly short time the Ninety-five Theses were read as far south as Jerusalem, and were echoed from the Grampian Hills. This was due, solely and alone, to the inherent virtue of the testimony. The old, dear voices that had been heard on Mount Zion, at Jacob's Well, in the Roman Catacombs, the voices of prophets and apostles, the "Thus saith the Lord," before which Western Asia, and Southern Europe, and Northern Africa had bowed a thousand years before, resounded again in the teaching of Luther. The days when the authority of the Word of God was supreme, when Athanasius faced Arius, and Augustine met Pelagius, with the challenge, "Thus it is written," seemed to have returned. The new era was ushered in with a solemn appeal to the written Word of God: "Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ says: Repent ye and believe the Gospel!" And every forward step in the reformatory move-

ment that had to be taken in order to maintain the original ground occupied by the reformer, was characterized by his unquestioning submission to the Bible.

In theological parlance the Bible is called the formal principle of the Reformation. The meaning is this: The Reformation was the reaffirmation of the authority of Scripture, over and against all human authority, for the regulation of the faith and conduct of Christians. That which gave due and proper form to Luther's teaching was its uncompromising scripturalness. In the Leipzig Disputation, in Luther's arraignment at Worms, at the Colloquy at Marburg, at the Diet of Augsburg, where the first Lutheran Confession was submitted, in every theological treatise, in every sermon, in every devotional writing, yea, even in the correspondence of Luther and his associates, there is this constant appeal to the Scriptures. Luther is acknowledged to have been the foremost Bible scholar of his age; and Lutheran theology of the sixteenth century is distinguished by this trait above all others, *viz.*, that it collects the testimony of Scripture on any one point of doctrine, takes in the entire range of revealed truth, ever careful not to admit anything that is not written in the Word of God, and then presents the finished product for men's examination and acceptance with this statement: Judge for yourselves! Do not believe us, but believe your Lord! The Convention at Smalcald, in 1537, Luther being present, adopted what has since become the standing rule of the Lutheran Church: "The Word of God should frame articles of faith, otherwise no one, not even an angel."

It was in the interest of this principle, and to the end of making the principle thoroughly operative, that Luther, as early as 1521, began the translation of the Bible into German. When the tradesman in his booth at the town-fair, the traveler at the wayside-inn, the peasant behind his plow, the servant in the nursery, could cite Bible proofs, and could state the will of their Maker and Redeemer in their own language,—it was then that the huge engine of fraud and oppression constructed

during a thousand years by grasping and perfidious priests came to a dead stop on the banks of the Elbe. At the point where the Reformer stood a great fountain seemed to have opened, and the waters were rushing forth with a prodigious force. The waters formed into a wide stream, branching out into many channels, and threatening to deluge the land with a knowledge which threw the entire Roman hierarchy into consternation and confusion. The old fountains of Israel, the still waters at which David had pictured the Good Shepherd pasturing His contented flock, the stream which had disappeared ten centuries ago, but had really flown underground, had come to the surface again, had forced an outlet through the rubbish of human ordinances and traditions that choked it, and the waste places of the Church were bursting into flower. A new spiritual spring had come: the nightingale was heard in the almond groves of Christ's garden; the sweet song of Heaven's unfathomable love for a sin-cursed world was poured out upon the listening midnight. Men heard it, doubting, wondering, exulting. And then there rose from thousands of German lips, which up to that time had chanted the melancholy litanies of Rome, the songs of the new age: "Es ist das Heil uns kommen her," "Nun freut euch, lieben Christen g'mein." But through all the joyous melodies of the young church there sounded, like the booming of the mighty surf on the rock-strewn beach, the valorous strains of the battle-hymn of the Reformation:

Das Wort sie sollen lassen stahn
Und kein'n Dank dazu haben.

Four hundred years will soon have passed, since all these things happened. The land which first gave a home to the Lutheran Church, where the infant faith of the young Church was cradled, has lost much of its Lutheran heritage. Above all, the basic principle of the Reformation, the Holy Scriptures, is being assailed in the very places in which Luther preached. It is the glory of the Lutheran Church of America that, without hardly any exception worth mentioning, she has been

staunch in the defense of the authority and sufficiency of the Scriptures; that her pastors make it a point of honor to know and to proclaim nothing but what God has spoken; that her laymen decline to accept what cannot be substantiated from the Book; and that laymen and clergymen are uniting their best efforts to raise up an intelligent membership for our Church, men who shall know why they are what they are, and who are ready any day to take the consequences of the faith they have espoused. In the Lutheran Church there is no room for a *fides carbonaria*, a faith like that of the Bohemian collier, who believed what the Church believed, although he was not able to state what the Church really did believe. From the fact that she is a Bible Church, and conditions membership upon an intelligent acceptance of Bible teaching, the Lutheran Church has advanced to the logical consequence of becoming an educating Church, which strives to create a well-informed laity and a well-trained clergy. It is as Michael Bréal, the able French scholar, has said: "In rendering man responsible for his faith in Holy Scriptures, the Reformation contracted the obligation of placing every one in a position to save himself by reading and studying the Bible."

It is not unlikely that this principle of the Lutheran Church will be contested again in our country by the old, bitter foe of the Lutheran Church. Quite recently there came into my hands a brochure written by Ernest R. Hull of the Society of Jesus. The pamphlet, which, with a number of others, has been issued from a Milwaukee press and is evidently intended for general distribution, discusses the question: "The Bible or the Church?" The author starts out by saying: "Protestants generally take it as a principle that the Bible is the sole and adequate rule of faith. This is only natural, since, after rejecting the authority of the Catholic Church, there is no other rule to be found." Continuing, the writer makes a very profound bow to the Bible and utters a pretty compliment on its unique distinction, but enters at once into an exhaustive argument to show that the Bible is insufficient for guiding the

faith of any Christian without the authentic interpretation of "the Church," meaning the Roman Church. When he has finished, you know exactly that he does not want you to place your confidence in the Bible. And when you recall the stately obeisance which he executed to the Bible at the start, and the pretty things which he managed to say about it, and then compare the ugly conclusion which he has reached, the exclamation rises to your lips involuntarily: "O hypocrisy, thy name is Rome!"

Let no Protestant be deceived into an unjustified security! The Roman Church has never acknowledged her defeat on the nethermost principle for which the Reformation contended, *viz.*, that man's faith in God, his Creator and Redeemer, must be wrought, guided, and supported by the Word of his God and Redeemer. The Roman Church claims to-day, as she has always done, to be the God-appointed arbiter of what man shall believe regarding his relation to God and to his fellowman. Her bold aggressiveness, her unscrupulous assertions, must send Protestants generally back to the primal facts of Reformation history, and stimulate afresh our interest in any enterprise which aims at the enlightening of the people and the reiteration of truths which Rome has never succeeded in stifling, and never shall.

In theological parlance the justification of a sinner by grace through faith in the merits of the Redeemer is called the material principle of the Reformation. This means that the chief matter for which the Reformer contended was, that in view of the vicarious life and death of His incarnate Son, God, the Judge of all the earth, has forgiven and still forgives to every penitent believer all his trespasses, freely, fully, and finally. This principle removes every mediation between God and the sinner, except that of Jesus Christ. It acknowledges no intercession for the sinner by the Mother of God or by other saints. It denies all justifying virtue to human works of holiness. It decries indulgences, masses for the departed, penal ordinances, and self-elected forms of devotion, which aim at

the obtaining of the divine favor, as futile and worthless in *negotio justificationis*, that is, so far as the power of these things to make a sinner acceptable in the sight of God is concerned. The Lutheran Church insists very earnestly on a sanctified conduct of her members. She has shown by her teaching how every state and occupation of men may be hallowed; how the street scavenger no less than the king, the mayor's wife and her kitchen servant, the university professor and the humble peasant's child, may each in their particular sphere serve God and their fellowman. But the Lutheran Church has ever refused to mingle human works of holiness, human virtue, into the saving of souls. The question, What must I do to be saved? she answers by directing the inquirer solely to Christ, by teaching him to disregard both his sins, which are real, and his virtues, which are specious, and to say with Luther: "*Male egerim, bene egerim; nihil ad me; ecce Christus!*" that is, "Whether I have done ill or well, is of no consequence. Behold, there is Christ, my Ransomer."

Around this palladium of Christianity the Lutheran Church has rallied also in this country, and for it she has battled manfully, and is still battling on American soil. This teaching she will not suffer to be vitiated by any of her own people. She still demands of all her members knowledge and acceptance of this truth, worded thus by Luther: "I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, or come to Him, but the Holy Ghost has called me by the Gospel, enlightened me with His gifts, sanctified and kept me in the one true faith with His holy Christian Church on earth; and that in this Church He daily and richly forgives to me and all believers in Christ all our sins." With this comforting assurance she greets the newcomer at her baptismal font and her altar; and with this imperishable consolation she speeds the parting soul on its last voyage heavenward.

The American Lutheran Church began her organized existence on this continent with the dedication of Gloria Dei

Church at Wicaco on the Delaware, now Philadelphia. *Gloria Dei*, the majesty of the righteous and the gracious God, as it appears in the marvelous work of the God-man,—this is the message with which the Lutheran Church came into our country. From *Gloria Dei* to *Gloria Deo* it is just as little a step as from the genitive to the dative in the Latin declension. *Soli Deo Gloria!*—All glory be to God alone!—that has been the silent or avowed sentiment which has breathed from every one of the varied activities of our church. The entire Church, not only the single edifice which the Swedes reared, and whose chief glory has since departed, might be called a *Gloria Dei* Church. The angel whom John beheld flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, has been understood by the Lutheran Church as a type of Luther. The angel is described as saying with a loud voice: “Fear God, and give glory unto Him; and worship Him that made the heaven, and the earth, and the sea, and the fountains of water.” This angel is followed by another, who proclaims: “Babylon is fallen!” and by a third, who announces the discomfiture of all who have worshiped the beast and his image. The abolition of the multiform idolatry of the Roman saint-worship, the assertion of the sole intercessorship of Christ with the Father in behalf of sinners, is one of the characteristics of the Reformation. Free access to God for the sinner by virtue of the advocacy of the Son, without the aid of any “Not-helper,” not even the Virgin Mary, is one of the trophies of the Reformation.

The Roman archbishop of Philadelphia is out in a pamphlet inscribed: “What Catholics Do Not Believe.” In this pamphlet there occurs, amongst other things, an ingenious defense of Mary worship. “Let us suppose for a moment,” says the writer, “that after Washington had achieved the liberties of the American people, he comes forward upon the platform before them. They are cheering him, their deliverer; and let us suppose that Washington’s mother comes out upon the plat-

form, and someone says: 'Let us cheer the mother that gave us such a son.' Do you think Washington would be jealous of the honor given to his own mother, and given her chiefly because she was his mother, because of him?" Continuing, the writer insinuates that when Catholics worship Mary, they mean no more than the bridegroom in a Protestant marriage according to the old English Book of Common Prayer means, when he says to the bride: "With this ring I wed thee, and with my body I thee worship." He claims that Catholics approach the Virgin in about the same way as an American citizen desiring an office from the President approaches some dear friend of the President, and asks him to obtain the office for him from the President. — Alongside of this representation we place the fact that Rome has raised Mary immensely above all the saints, by claiming for her immaculate conception, thus lifting her out of the sphere of common mankind and placing her within that sphere of sinlessness where God alone moves. We place alongside of the archbishop's claim the entire Roman ritual with its ceaseless *Ave Marias*, its *Sancta Maria, ora pro nobis!* — Holy Mother, pray for us! — prayers which both in form and content ascribe to Mary powers that belong to the deity alone, and actually make Mary's intercession the basis of a sinner's hope for obtaining a hearing with Christ and God. And thus we note also in regard to this point that Rome has not changed her teaching. Enthusiastic promoters of her cause in North America are eagerly looking forward to a day when the Angelus bell shall call the American millions to prayer from Bedloe's Island to the Golden Gate, and from Duluth to Corpus Christi. What will be the character of those prayers? We may rest assured that they will not be couched in terms of Old Hundred, or of the doxology that was wafted heavenward from Plymouth Rock.

There is still need, then, of loyal hearts in our land, hearts that cherish as Heaven's most priceless gift to fallen man the unconditioned love of the Savior, the guerdon of humble faith. Men will look to this Western Continent for confessors to hold

aloft the chiefest trophies of the mighty conflict which convulsed Europe four hundred years ago. The foundations of the American Lutheran Church are laid in the bed-rock of the Word of God. Within her walls pure worship is being offered to the Triune God; from her sanctuaries streams the light and flows the life that directs and quickens the step of the pilgrim who is reaching out with yearning heart for the greater glory beyond. In the twilight hours of this waning world-day, toward eventide, there has been kindled in this country by God's gracious hand the Pharos light of the blessed Gospel, which throws its genial rays over the darkling waters of an ocean of sin, fills the land of the saved with the glory of Jehovah, and penetrates the gathering shadows of infidelity even in far-off lands. We are no enthusiasts. We are not dreaming of Lutheranizing America or the world. We ask for no admission to a Pan-Lutheran millennium. We are not filling our brains with idle fancies; we are not building beautiful castles in Spain, or chasing the phantom rainbow of illusive hopes. We are conscious only of sober duties, which God, who has blessed us, blessing has laid upon us. We only hear the earnest call of the present hour. It summons laymen and pastors to united efforts in upholding the basic principles of the Christian Church: *Sola Scriptura*, and *Sola Gratia*! Our all-engrossing concern shall be to diligently teach, confess, and enforce the truth of God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure to any one who will hear us. Our one and only care shall be that we may do our own work well, not that our work may be well rewarded.

The American Lutheran Church of to-day has grown out of most insignificant beginnings. Out of their pinching poverty and numberless limitations our fathers managed to begin the building of the Church which engages our loving efforts to-day. The times have changed, our faith has not. We wear different garments, we dwell in different houses, we speak, many of us, a different tongue than that of the "Fatherland" ever dear to us. These things have become altered, but our Creed is the same. And judging from significant manifestations of the recent past,

we may safely say that our loyalty to that Creed has not changed. New York Lutherans, in particular, have achieved exceptionally great things of late, as large-hearted, far-seeing, and liberal friends of the cause of Christian education, and as fearless spokesmen in behalf of a truth that is being studied with intense interest throughout our land. With our increased facilities, our enlarged fortunes, our greater horizon, and our wider field of activity we purpose to accomplish greater things for our Church; however, guided and succored and prospered in every undertaking by that same Sovereign Hand which has blessed to us the day of small things and now proceeds to bless to us the day of larger resources.

May His unfailing grace speed us on our way, until the consummation of all His merciful counsels shall have been attained, and the paean of our Church:

God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure
Shall to eternity endure—

shall rise and swell into the greater song around the glassy sea.

Prof. WESSEL'S CONTROVERSY WITH FATHER FOLEY.

At a meeting of the Eucharistic League, in Springfield, Ill., Father M. J. Foley of Quincy, Ill., delivered a sermon on "The Holy Eucharist," which was published *in toto* in a local newspaper, and contained in one of its parts a rehashing of moldy slander against Luther handed down by popish calumniators in the great Reformer's day. This present-day representative of Roman Catholic pulpit oratory, in the course of his sermon, marched out the church fathers to satisfy the faithful ones that they believed and taught the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and with special delight he quoted St. Cyril of Jerusalem as saying: "What seems to be bread is not bread, but the body of Christ; and what seems to be wine is not wine, but the blood of Christ." Then he invited his audience to make a study of patristic theology, and to include

in their reading matter the works of the Roman popes and the decrees of the councils of the church. He assured his hearers:

Martin Luther read them, hence, in the year 1532, writing to Albert, Duke of Prussia, he gave this startling testimony: "This article about the Eucharist has been admitted by common consent from the days of Christ even to our own times. The writings of the fathers, both Greek and Latin, prove this. Hence, to raise doubts on this subject would be to condemn as heretics Christ Himself, the apostles and prophets." What do you think of these words of the arch-reformer? They were wrung from him by stubborn facts. Why, then, did he make shipwreck of his faith in the holy mass? Writing to his disciple, Capito, he says: "I would gladly deny the doctrine of the Eucharist." Why? Listen to his reason for wishing to deny the doctrine of the mass: "I would willingly deny it and so deal the last deadly blow to the pope of Rome, but," he laments, "that doctrine is too firmly established in the Bible; it is unassailable."

And finally, to climax it all, the priest reproduced a hackneyed fable, now nearly four hundred years old, in this fashion:

If it was unassailable, how did he (Luther) come to reject the holy mass? In his writings he tells us why. He tells us how he had an audience with the devil, yes, with His Satanic Majesty. Luther gives us the arguments set forth by the Father of Lies, and assures us that he became convinced that the mass was rank idolatry. Luther listened to Satan's arguments, and ceased to ascend the altar of God. We are shocked. We stand abashed in the presence of such conduct. Christ, the eternal Truth, says, "This is my body." The Catholic hears, believes, and adores. Satan, the Father of Lies, says, "No, it is not his body, and it is rank idolatry to adore it." Luther rejects the doctrine of Christ, accepts the teachings of Satan, and ceases to ascend the altar of God.

Such palpable misquotations could not go by unchallenged; and so the Rev. Prof. L. Wessel, at the urgent request of his brethren, assumed the duty of an unpleasant controversy with a biased opponent and carried it to a successful finish. In response to the above jumble of misrepresentations the Professor delivered in substance the same lecture, first before the student body of Concordia Seminary, and then before a large number of members of Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church. Since the priest's alleged quotations from Luther and his com-

ment thereon made it appear as if Luther had granted only with great reluctance that the church fathers taught the real presence, and as if he had lamented to find this doctrine in the Bible, the Professor brought, in place of the above garbled quotations, Luther's own words with the necessary remarks. Luther's letter to Albert, Duke of Prussia, reads in part thus:

This article (of the Lord's Supper) is not a doctrine or tradition fabricated by men, but clearly found and established in the Gospel, in plain, clear, and indubitable words of Christ, unanimously believed and held from beginning by the Christian Church in all the world, up to this hour, as is proved by the books and writings of the dear fathers, both of the Latin and Greek tongue. Hence, as it has been unanimously held from the beginning within the pale of whole Christendom, every doubter of it now does actually as much as not believing a Christian Church at all and condemning, at the same time, not alone the entire Christian Church as a damnable heretic, but also Christ Himself, with all apostles and prophets. (St. Louis ed., vol. XX, 1684.)

And Luther's letter, dated December 15, 1524, addressed to the Christians at Strassburg—not to Capito, as the priest informed his hearers—in the passage touched upon by the Roman clergyman, reads thus:

I confess, if Dr. Carlstadt or any other person could have convinced me five years ago that the Sacrament contains nothing but bread and wine, he would have done me a great service. I suffered indeed great straits of doubt, and I struggled and writhed, as I would have been glad to be at liberty, for I saw full well that I could have then dealt popery the hardest blow. And there are two persons who have written to me on this matter with more ability than Dr. Carlstadt and have not distorted the words to their notion in the same degree as he. But I am conscience-bound, I cannot liberate myself: *the text is too powerful*, and cannot be removed from the mind by words. (St. Louis ed., vol. XV, 2050.)

A report of the Professor's answers to the papist's unfounded accusations appeared in the newspapers, and in consequence several lengthy articles on the disputed points were published in the dailies. In these articles Luther's "audience with the devil" was given more prominence; and about this ridiculous myth the Professor wrote:

Of this "audience" Luther writes in his book entitled, "Dr. Martin Luther's Treatise Concerning Private Mass (Winkelmesse) and the Consecration of Priests (Pfaffenweihe)." In it he does not give us the reason why he rejected the mass, as the opponent contends. Luther had rejected the mass ten years prior to this so-called audience. In this book, furthermore, he does not say that he had a personal "audience" with His Satanic Majesty. What he does say is that he "had a disputation *in his heart* with the devil." Is that anything strange in a Christian's experience? Does not the holy apostle say, "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places"? On this particular occasion, what was it that the devil assailed him with? Luther, prior to his conversion, had been a monk and a priest. For fifteen long years, he says, he had participated in this mass against the injunction of his Lord. The sin thereby committed again fell heavily upon his soul. That's the gist of the matter. The book is written in excellent German. The thoughts are clearly developed, the contents interesting and instructive. The book is self-interpreting. Read it! Furthermore, an author is the best interpreter of his own writings. That's a principle recognized the world over. Accord Luther the same privilege. Regarding this selfsame matter, Luther writes in a later treatise: "In my book I have not attacked the sin against, and the abuse of, the Sacrament (Lord's Supper), but the perverted order of the mass, as it stands in direct opposition to Christ's institution, not for our sake,—since we are now rid and free of the private mass more than ten years,—but that their own people see for themselves upon what rotten and rank lies and nonsense their idol, *i. e.*, their mass, stands." So Luther doesn't say that it was through the devil's argument at "this disputation in his heart" that he first learned to know that the mass is rank idolatry, but he says: "In that book I have attacked the perverted order of the mass." So before this "audience" he knew the mass was wrong. How did he know it is wrong? He answers: "It stands in direct opposition to Christ's injunction." How long before had he rejected the mass? Ten years.—Arguments *pro* and *con*.

1. Luther says: "I had a disputation in my heart with the devil." Father Foley says: "Luther had an audience with the devil, yes, with His Satanic Majesty." To have "a disputation in my heart with the devil" and to have "an audience with the devil" is not one and the same thing. Here's the first injustice done to Luther.

2. Luther says: "I rejected the mass ten years prior to this disputation." Father Foley says: "In consequence of this audience with the devil Luther rejected the mass." That's the second injustice done to Luther.

3. Luther says: "I did not reject the Lord's Supper, but the perverted order of the mass." Father Foley says: "In consequence of this audience Luther rejected the words of Christ: 'This is my body.'" This is the third injustice done to Luther by Father Foley. Well might we exclaim: "We are shocked! We stand abashed in the presence of such conduct!"

The Roman priest at no time made an attempt at proof. He simply reiterated the misinterpreted passage from Luther's writings used in his sermons, and declared he would continue to repeat it. But that he had placed himself in a hopeless dilemma he well knew, because he had artlessly asserted, "It is immaterial as to when he (Luther) renounced the mass." In addition to this, he made a grand splurge for the edification of his readers about Roman Catholic doctrine in regard to religion and sacrifice and transubstantiation, adduced a long array of quotations from the church fathers, in support of his dogmatical effort, filled two columns with other foreign matter, and thus tried to obscure the question of debate, "Was Luther correctly quoted and interpreted?" Digressing also in other directions, he reasserted the old absurdity that Lutherans teach impanation and consubstantiation and contrary to Christ's words make the Savior say, "Here is my body." To this the Professor answered:

Cyclopedias may ascribe these doctrines to us, but that does not make them Lutheran doctrine. As to the remark, "According to Lutherans Christ should have said, 'Here is my body'" — that is naive. Lutherans well know how to express their doctrines, as witness the Augsburg Confession with its twenty-eight articles, delivered at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530.

But this Roman father resorted to even baser tactics. Because he well knew that Luther's doctrine is invincible, he vented his spleen on Luther's person, citing various bitter foes of the Reformer who believed him either mad or possessed by

an evil spirit. In answer to this he was reminded, among other things, of the word of Luther: "If the devil cannot prevail against the doctrine, he slanders the person who preaches God's doctrines." Thus of John the Baptist and of Christ Himself it was said that they were possessed of the devil."

In his concluding article the papist still maintained, in the face of all proof from the writings of Luther, that the devil persuaded Luther to reject the mass at the so-called audience; however, he no longer called it an "audience," but receded a few steps and termed it a "conference" and a "dispute." But he was very far from conceding that it was "a disputation in the heart," as Luther styles it. To disarm the priest completely in the eyes of all "truth-loving people" and his "honest Lutheran friends," to whom the priest had appealed so blandly and *usque ad nauseam*, expressing also the hope that his Lutheran friends might "find a way to recover their birthright, the mass," Prof. Wessel, in his reply to the priest's concluding article, extended to every interested person a courteous invitation to visit Concordia Seminary library and to verify from Luther's own complete works the truth of his statements made in regard to the treatise of Luther under discussion. Then the Professor went on in his article to say:

And now to show you the utter impossibility of Father Foley's being in the right in this argument, I will say that Luther had this "disputation" in the year 1533, at a time when he had left the Catholic Church long, long ago, and long ago knew that the mass was rank idolatry.

Father Foley had said this "disputation" had taken place when Luther was at the Wartburg. The Professor continued:

The Reformation began in 1517; the Diet of Worms was held in 1521, where Luther gave utterance to the memorable words: "Unless I am convinced by the testimony of the Word of God, etc., I cannot and will not recant anything," etc. He closed thus, "Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise; God help me! Amen." In 1530 the famous Diet at Augsburg was held at which the Lutherans delivered the Augsburg Confession. Among other articles it treats of the Lord's Supper; in another it speaks of the mass, and the

error connected therewith. It says this doctrine as taught then by the opponents is a departure from the Holy Scriptures. It rejects this doctrine as false. So this is proof positive that Luther and his colaborers at and before this time held the mass as taught by the Roman Catholics to be utterly wrong. And now observe, kind reader, that it was three years later, in 1533, that Luther had this "disputation in his heart," in consequence of which Father Foley says, "Luther assures us" that he then first became convinced that the mass was rank idolatry! Do you require proof that this "disputation" occurred in 1533? One may suffice. In a letter to Hausmann, dated December 17, 1533, Luther mentions the treatise containing that "disputation" as one lately published, and in the same letter he refers to the disputation as having taken place "recently." Judge for yourselves! I don't fear the verdict of fair-minded readers. Said one, and a non-Lutheran at that, after reading my former article: "Well, I see, Luther is well able to defend himself." But Father Foley is much like the village schoolteacher in Goldsmith's "Deserted Village," of whom we read:

For e'en though vanquish'd, he could argue still,
While words of learned length, and thundering sound,
Amazed the gazing rustics ranged around;
And still they gazed, and still the wonder grew
That one small head could carry all he knew.
But, past is all his fame.

One point which this blundering vassal of the pope wished to carry in his sermon and in every one of his newspaper contributions was to impress others with the view that Luther did not believe in the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, and that, since he rejected the mass, he also rejected the Lord's Supper. He had, however, in the heat of the controversy, forgotten this and had quoted, this time true to the text, passages from Luther's Small Catechism, his Large Catechism, and the Formula of Concord which show clearly that Luther and, with him, the whole Lutheran Church adhere faithfully to the words of Christ: "This is my body." Professor Wessel did not fail to remind his floundering opponent to his chagrin and to his disgrace of the concession he had unwittingly made, and the slap he had dealt himself. Notwithstanding, this ardent champion of the mass bent every effort to prove that Luther had renounced the doctrine of the real

presence. So he boldly delved into history, but produced such a mess of fabrications as would have caused even Baron von Muenchhausen to turn green with envy. An enumeration of some of his worst antics, with the necessary comment from the Lutheran side, follows:

1. He (Foley) says: "In response to the wishes of the Elector of Saxony and of Philip of Hesse Luther drew up the Articles of Smalcald."—What are the facts? Philip of Hesse had not uttered a wish to Luther in regard to the drawing up of these articles. This was at the request of the Elector alone. (Compare Seckendorf, *Historia*, liber III.) This is Father Foley's first fiction.

2. Father Foley says: "The Articles of Smalcald differed in several important points from the Augsburg Confession."—What are the facts? If this assertion means that the Smalcald Articles differ from the Augsburg Confession in 1530 doctrinally, I declare this to be an assertion without foundation of fact. Luther's doctrinal position in 1537 is absolutely that of 1530. The Augsburg Confession distinctly rejects the Sacramentarian view in the Tenth Article. This is Father Foley's second fiction.

3. Father Foley says: "Luther wrote to Philip that he was in favor of uniting with the (Swiss) Sacramentarians, though he had condemned their teachings before." Father Foley here intimates that Luther was ready to unite with the Sacramentarians in spite of their false doctrine, that "we find Luther drifting farther and farther from his former belief in the real presence in the Holy Eucharist, and doing so to placate the Swiss Sacramentarians."—What are the facts? In 1529 there was an abortive conference between the Swiss Sacramentarians and Luther at Marburg. Why was the conference barren of favorable results? Because Luther would not surrender the scriptural doctrine of the Lord's Supper. In 1536 there was another attempt at concord, and a union was effected. Why had this meeting a favorable termination? Because Bucer and Capito came over to Luther's view and faith as respects the Lord's Supper. Witness their own statement in the Articles of Agreement. Bucer recanted his former false doctrine in a public sermon held at Wittenberg a few days after the conference. (See Seckendorf, liber III; Walch XVII, 2534; Rudelbach, *Reformation*, etc., page 363 sqq.) This is Father Foley's third fiction.

4. Father Foley says: "To gratify these men, Melanchthon, under the direction of Luther, dropped from the Augsburg Confession these words: "The body and blood of Christ are veritably present in the

Eucharist," and in their place he inserted: "The body and blood of Christ," etc.—What are the facts? Melancthon changed the Augsburg Confession of 1530. He did this without the knowledge of Luther. When Luther's attention was directed to the alteration, he remonstrated with Melancthon and sorely upbraided him for his action. Luther never accepted the alterations, but continuously and strenuously rejected them. (See Krauth, *Conservative Reformation*, p. 246; *Hauptverteidigung des Augapfels*, p. 340.) This is Father Foley's fourth fiction.

The Lutheran Church in her confession, the Formula of Concord of 1580, states with emphasis (Article VII, p. 653, § 33, German and Latin edition) that Luther never changed the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as laid down in the Augsburg Confession. Here are the words: "Dr. Luther, who certainly understood the tone and proper meaning of the Augsburg Confession, rather than others, and constantly adhered to it and defended it, till the end of his life, in his last confession, a little before his death, confessed his faith concerning this article (Lord's Supper) with great zeal, and repeated it in the following words, where he thus writes: 'I reckon all those in the same number . . . who will not believe that the bread of the Lord in the Supper is His true natural body, which the ungodly or Judas, as well as St. Peter and all other saints, received orally. Whoever, I say, will not believe this, should let me alone and not expect to hold fellowship with me; and to this principle I must adhere.' From this exposition, but more especially from Dr. Luther's explanation, who is the principal divine of the Augsburg Confession, every intelligent person, who loves truth and peace, can perceive with certainty what has always been the proper meaning and sense of the Augsburg Confession concerning this article." So far the Lutheran Confession.—How dare Father Foley, in the face of such unimpeachable testimony, assert that Luther changed his doctrinal position on the Lord's Supper?

5. Father Foley says: "The poor innocent people were attached to the holy mass, hence Luther, to wean them away by deception, retained the vestments, lights, elevation of host, and chalice, in order, as he said, that visitors from foreign parts, seeing those outward ceremonies, would feel that they were in an orthodox Catholic church."—What are the facts? Since 1520 Luther wrote and spoke against the abomination of the popish mass. The mass was abolished in the main church at Wittenberg. The opposition against the Roman Catholic Church was so great that the people were hard to restrain. Excesses occurred which caused Luther's return to Wittenberg. In a

series of sermons, than which there are none more powerful or evangelical in any language, Luther called the people back to Christian moderation. He showed the necessity of distinguishing essentials and non-essentials, sin and Christian liberty. The mass continued abolished, but some of the ceremonies were re-established. Why? Because the doctrine and not indifferent ceremonies make a church apostolic and pure. This principle was embodied in the Augsburg Confession, Article XV, where we read: "Concerning ecclesiastical rites made by men, they (the Lutherans) teach that those rites are to be observed which may be without sin, and are of value for tranquillity and good order in the church, such as set holidays, feasts, and the like. Yet concerning these things men are to be admonished that consciences are not to be burdened as if such exercises were necessary to their salvation. Also they are to be admonished that human traditions, instituted to propitiate God, to deserve grace, and make satisfaction for sins, are opposed to the Gospel and the doctrine of faith." (Compare Guericke, *Church History*, III, p. 57; *Ideas That Have Influenced Civilization*, V, p. 156.) This is Father Foley's fifth fiction.

Thus the pope's devotees fight for their mutual master's, the devil's, cause, and, as the children of the Father of Lies, resort to any, even the most infamous, means to gain their end, the greater glory of the church of Antichrist! And even if this priest lies outright, and asserts, among other falsehoods, that this controversy had been forced upon him, and tries to pose as one persecuted, whereas he began it with his shameful and baseless attacks upon Luther and Lutheran doctrine, yet he finds to his satisfaction that there is union in the camp of the devil, for he received from Washington, D. C., a very brotherly letter of commendation from the Apostolic Delegate Falconio for the services rendered in this disputation, as a *defensor fidei*. But the prelate's applause may only have been intended for the gratification of the galleries, as his satellite was completely routed and had no more to say.

Springfield, Ill.

OTTO C. A. BOECLER.

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

(Continued.)

CHRIST OUR KING.

Christ's kingship was foretold in the Old Testament. "Thou hast put all things under His feet: all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowls of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas," Ps. 8. And what Daniel saw in the night vision he thus describes: "Behold, one like the *Son of Man* came with clouds, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion and glory, and a *kingdom*, that all people, nations, and languages should serve Him," Dan. 7, 13. 14. Christ is a king. Hence the enquiry of the wise men from the East was: "Where is He that is *born King* of the Jews?" Matt. 2, 2.

According to the various subjects and diverse modes of government Christ's kingdom is threefold: 1. the *kingdom of power*, pertaining to all creatures; 2. the *kingdom of grace*, pertaining to the Church militant; and 3. the *kingdom of glory*, pertaining to the Church triumphant.

In that final interview with His disciples in Galilee, and as a prelude to His last Great Commission, Christ speaks of Himself as the King of the universe. He said:

Matt. 28, 18: *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.*

The sphere of His kingdom is indicated by the phrase: "*in heaven and in earth.*" How vast is that kingdom! He possesses all power "*in heaven*" — all the holy angels, authorities, powers, the cherubim and the seraphim, are His willing servants. And "*in earth,*" too, "all things are put under His feet." His kingship is world-wide, universal. A grand, a majestic truth! Christ rules and reigns over all, whatever it

may be, however powerful it may be, wherever it may be, "in heaven or in earth"—all, all is in His kingdom, the heathen that rage, the kings of the earth and its rulers, aye, the very devils in hell not excepted. His is all power without any limitation. Over all He mightily rules and reigns. This is His kingdom of *power!*

And why is it so called? Because the means whereby He rules in this kingdom is, as stated in the text, "*all power.*" "*All power,*" *all authority,* clearly is *omnipotence.* If His omnipotent word goes forth, who can withstand? And so, "why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and against His Anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision," Ps. 2.

Of this "all power," this omnipotence, Christ says, It is "*given to me.*" The divine nature of Christ possesses omnipotence as an *essential* attribute, but this essential attribute, by virtue of the personal union, becomes a *communicated* attribute of the human nature. The man Christ is almighty. The God-man was not exalted to royal dignity and power after His resurrection or ascension, but was *born* a king, Matt. 2, 2. 6; Luke 2, 11; Is. 9, 6. This "all power," given unto Him according to His humanity, He manifested before His exaltation by numerous miracles, thus proving the truth expressed in our text and in that other saying of His: "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father," Matt. 11, 25. He rebuked the winds and the sea, and they obeyed Him, Matt. 8, 27. He walked on the sea, Matt. 14, 26. He cast out evil spirits with His word, and healed the sick, Matt. 8, 16. With a single word He felled His captors, John 18, 6. He spoke to him that was dead: "Young man, I say unto thee, arise; and he . . . sat up and began to speak," Luke 7, 14. 15. The winds, the sea, the evil spirits, the devil, sicknesses, enemies, death—all are subject to His power.

This truth affords great *consolation* for us, since our King so regulates the whole universe and all things upon earth as to contribute to the glory of His divine name and to the gathering and preservation of His Church. "We believe according to the working of His *mighty power*," Eph. 1, 19. By virtue of His omnipotence the spiritually dead Lazaruses are made spiritually alive. The Church is gathered through His almighty Word. And this His Church He protects against all enemies, aye, against the very devil himself, for as He, the King, said: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," Matt. 16, 18. Why, the very connection in which the words of our text stand to the Last Great Commission of our King prove the same majestic truth. "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Go ye *therefore* and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you. And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." As if to say: Ye ambassadors of mine, be not afraid! Ye are to wage war against the formidable kingdom of Satan, to destroy its bulwarks, and upon its ruins ye are to plant the cross, the emblem of the Crucified One. What a task! But fear not ye! "Go ye *therefore*," since mine is all power, go ye therefore and build my Church. Though you will no longer enjoy my *visible* presence, *invisibly* I will be with you, guide you, protect you in the performance of your sacred office. "Disciple the nations, baptizing them," etc., and when the last one according to God's decree has been brought into the Church, then will the end come and the scaffold of this world will be torn down, since it has served its purpose; the *una sancta*, the holy Christian Church, will be complete. So, then, this "all power," His omnipotence, wherewith our King mightily rules over all creatures, has but one object in view—the gathering and the preservation of His Church, which is called His kingdom of *grace*.

This universal kingship of Christ is not apparent to the

natural eye. As the writer of Hebrews says: "But now we see not yet all things put under Him," Hebr. 2, 8. It is an article of faith which we are to lay hold of for our consolation. In yonder life, when the mists will have been lifted from our eyes and our vision will be clear, when we no longer know in part, we shall see that this whole universe, together with its governments, rulers, and ordinances, lay in the hollow of Christ our King's hands and were made subservient to His gracious purpose—the building of the kingdom of grace. And what is this kingdom?

John 18, 37: *Pilate therefore said unto Him, Art Thou a king, then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.*

In the trial before Pilate, Jesus had said, "My kingdom is not of this world," etc., v. 36. He spoke of His special kingdom of grace, which, though *in* the world, is "not of this world." Pilate asks, "Art Thou a king, then?" Jesus, asserting that He, indeed, is a king, and describing the true character of His kingdom, makes answer: I am a king; I am a *born* king; I am a king of the *truth*. Who are His subjects? "*Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.*" Every one "that is of the truth," that is born of God, whose heart has been conquered and won by the truth unto which He bears witness, belongs to this kingdom. This is a mark of the true subjects in this kingdom: they hear *His voice*. Who hears His voice? The Christians, the believers. And these, collectively, constitute His kingdom. Wherever the believer may live, to whatsoever nationality he may belong, whatsoever language he may speak—in the eyes of Christ he belongs to that "holy nation" of which Peter speaks, 1 Pet. 2, 9. This kingdom Christ rules by *His voice*, the Gospel, the Gospel of grace. Hence it is not a worldly kingdom, but a *spiritual* kingdom. Another name for this kingdom is the Church, the communion of saints.—Of this same kingdom the following passage treats.

Matt. 21, 5: *Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold, Thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt, the foal of an ass.*

The context speaks of Christ's royal entry into Jerusalem. By it, the Evangelist avers, the prophecy recorded in Zech. 9, 9 was fulfilled. Zechariah describes the New Testament kingdom of peace and grace. The King of Zion, whom, according to the context of the prophecy, the heathen also shall serve, v. 10, is the Messiah, the son of David, He, whom the multitudes pronounce to be "Jesus, the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee," Matt. 21, 11. The subjects of this kingdom are denominated "the daughter of Zion," the daughter of Jerusalem, *i. e.*, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, who represent the people of Israel. But the true, the spiritual Israel is meant, the Church of God, God's people, as contradistinguished from the heathen world. Zech. 9, 3—8. Accordingly, when the announcement is made to the daughter of Zion: "Thy King cometh unto thee," the Christian Church is accosted, *i. e.*, the believers gathered from among Jews and Gentiles, for they are the true, spiritual Israel.

To "the daughter of Zion" Christ comes "*meek*." Thereby the Evangelist indicates the rule of this kingdom. Christ rules therein with "meekness," *i. e.*, by His grace, by His Word of grace, the Gospel of salvation. "Thy King cometh unto thee, *meek*." "Flee not, be not despondent! Your king does not approach you as He did Adam or Cain, or as at the time of the flood, or when He visited Babylon, or Sodom and Gomorrah. Nor does He come to you as He did to the people of Israel on Mount Sinai. He makes His advent not in anger to take you to account; wrath is all laid aside, there is nothing but meekness and kindness. He purposes to treat you in such a manner that your heart may be of good cheer, love, and confidence toward Him, to cling to Him and seek shelter in Him." (Luther, Erl. ed. X, 13.) — In other words, by means of His Word Christ rules over the *hearts* of His subjects; hence this kingdom of grace is a spiritual kingdom. Of it Christ, speaking to the carnal-minded Pharisees, says, Luke

17, 20. 21: "The kingdom of God cometh not by observation" — its coming cannot be observed with the bodily eyes. "Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, Lo there!" — a definite locality cannot be assigned to it, — "for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you," it is of a spiritual nature, has its seat in the heart. There the King erects His throne and fills it with joy, and grace, and comfort, and peace that surpasseth all understanding. — And when Christ's loyal subjects die, they pass out of the world, but remain in His kingdom — the kingdom of *glory*.

2 Tim. 4, 18: *The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto His heavenly kingdom: to whom be glory for ever and ever! Amen.*

Having recounted several instances in which God preserved him, Paul concludes the letter proper with the words: "*The Lord*," as He has so often done in the past, "*shall deliver me*," also in the future, "*from every evil work*" that my enemies may concoct against me. From these words we see: the kingdom of grace is at the same time a kingdom of the *cross*. But final deliverance will surely come. In spite of all trials and tribulations here below, the King guards and protects His subjects "from every evil work," and we shall and can rest assured with Paul that He "*will preserve us unto His heavenly kingdom*." From the Church militant the believers are transplanted into the Church triumphant, from the kingdom of grace into the *kingdom of glory*. Here "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away," Rev. 21, 4. Here the cross, there the crown. "Now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face," 1 Cor. 13, 12.

As our Prophet, Priest, and King Christ is our Redeemer. As Prophet He taught the way of salvation; as Priest He merited salvation, and as King He imparts what He has merited, governs and protects us, and leads us into His heavenly kingdom. Thus Christ is our Lord.

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

BOOK REVIEW.

SO NIMM DENN MEINE HAENDE! Ein Mahn- und Trostbuechlein fuer lutherische Konfirmanden. 83 pages. Price: Cloth, 20 cts.; cloth, gilt edge, 25 cts.

BE THOU MY GUIDE! A Handbook of Advice and Comfort for Young Lutherans Newly Confirmed. 86 pages. (Price same as foregoing.) Both publications from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

These two parallel publications emphasize afresh the bilingual character of the Missouri Synod. The contents of both are identical; the English publication, however, is not a mere translation, but a free reproduction of the German. In ten brief chapters the young Lutheran is shown: 1. the validity of his confirmation vow; 2. his inability to keep it merely by his own good resolutions; 3. the divine guidance and protection of which he may avail himself; 4. the God-ordained means for perseverance; 5. the required cooperation of the converted with divine grace; 6. and 7. perils arising in a sinful world to a sanctified conduct; 8. Christian companionship; 9. the honorable badge of Lutheranism; 10. the return to grace of the fallen. A Supplement furnishes a prayer suitable for "some dark day of great spiritual affliction." The chief merit of the book lies in the very effectual application of plain and telling passages of Scripture, ever the glory of genuinely Lutheran pastoral effort, and especially necessary in the guidance of the young. The Scriptural logic *e. g.* of the first chapter is overwhelming.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., announces the following brochures in the form of records of synodical conventions:

1. A thesis by *Rev. E. Huebner*: "A well-ordered, truly Lutheran congregation employs no unrighteous means in order to attain its righteous ends;" submitted to the Wisconsin District of the Missouri Synod. 43 pages. Price, 15 cts.

2. A paper by *Rev. F. E. Pasche* on The Distinctive Doctrines of the Reformed Churches and the Lutheran Church; submitted to the South Dakota District of the Missouri Synod. 34 pages. Price, 12 cts.

3. A paper by *Rev. M. J. Von der Au* on The Times, Life, and Activity of the Prophet Elisha; submitted to the Iowa District of the Missouri Synod. 49 pages. Price, 15 cts.

4. A paper by *Rev. J. Sohn* on The State, the Bible, and the Papacy; submitted to the Canada District of the Missouri Synod. 48 pages. Price, 12 cts.

5. A paper by *Rev. Th. Schurdel* on Justification as set forth in Rom. 3, 21—4, 8; submitted to the Central District of the Missouri Synod. 26 pages. Price, 12 cts.

6. A paper by *Rev. H. Haserodt* on the words of the Creed: "I believe a life everlasting;" submitted to the California and Nevada District of the Missouri Synod, and to be continued. 41 pages. Price, 12 cts.

7. A paper (continued) by *Rev. W. Broecker* on Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ; submitted to the Eastern District of the Missouri Synod. 31 pages. Price, 12 cts.

WIDERLEGUNG DER VON PASTOR ALLWARDT HERAUSGEGEBENEN
SCHRIFT: "Die jetzige Lehre der Synode von Missouri
von der ewigen Wahl Gottes." Von *J. F. F. Gerike*.
Second Edition. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing
House. 1910. 64 pages. Price, 20 cts.

By a questionable method a recent brochure of Dr. Allwardt of the Ohio Synod, purporting to set forth the genesis of the late Election Controversy between the Synods of Ohio and Missouri and to restate the points in controversy, was being disseminated in the Missouri Synod. The present pamphlet is a reply to Dr. Allwardt, so eminently fair and convincing that we should expect Dr. Allwardt to withdraw publicly the untenable statements he has made.

DIE FRAGE IM UNTERRICHT. Kurze Theorie der fragenden
Lehrform von *D. Meibohm*. New Orleans, La. To be
had of the author. 100 pages.

The Gulf State Conference of pastors and teachers of our Synod, which some time ago ordered the publication of this well-digested treatise, no doubt did so from a belief that the book would prove generally useful. There is an immense amount of labor in its few pages, and the mere naming of the subject must attract every catechist and every teacher who employs the Socratic method of teaching.

The careful perusal of the patient research and the discriminating reflections of the author will pay any reader. There can be little doubt, we think, that one of the reasons why catechising is at times barren of results is the inability of the catechist to formulate the question effectually. Teacher Meibohm's book ably discusses the difficulties of this form of teaching, and points out the way to meet them.

Concordia Publishing House calls attention to its leading monthlies:

1. *Lehre und Wehre*, now entering upon its 56th year. In the January issue Dr. Stoeckhardt reviews the course of this theological monthly during the last thirty years. Prof. Bente reports, and exhibits in part, the newly-discovered commentary on Romans by Luther, of the year 1515/16, and offers the usual digest and criticism of noteworthy happenings in the theological world at home and abroad.

2. *Magazin fuer ev.-luth. Homiletik und Pastoraltheologie*, which now enters upon its 34th year. The January issue contains an exegetico-homiletical study of John 11, 20—27 by Prof. Mezger and sermons and sermon outlines by various authors. The English appendix, now in its eighth year, offers three sermons on sixteen pages.

3. *Evangelisch-Lutherisches Schulblatt*, now in its 45th year. The table of contents registers thirteen papers relating to pedagogical subjects, among them one "On the Personality and Personal Influence of the Teacher," and another "On Irregular Attendance and Tardiness at School."

THE WAY OF LIFE, OR, WHY SHOULD YOU BE A CHRISTIAN AND A CHURCH MEMBER? By *G. Luecke*. American Lutheran Publication Board, Pittsburg, Pa. Published by the author. 96 pages. Price, 30 cts.; dozen, 25 cts. each, not postpaid; hundred, 23 cts. each, not postpaid.

Prof. Luecke of Concordia College, Conover, N. C., has a fine gift of reasoning calmly and practically on great matters, and of putting his thought into easy form. In the present booklet we find the believer's evidence on such matters as the existence of God, the hereafter, the credibility of the Scriptures, the distinguishing features of Christianity, salvation, repentance and conversion, the true

Church, unionism, syncretism, etc., presented to the unbeliever, the skeptic, and the indifferentist. The presentation is spiced with apt quotations, anecdotes which illustrate well the point to be exhibited, and enlivened with an occasional *reductio ad absurdum*. The book will be gladly read by the old and the young.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ELEVENTH CONVENTION of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri and Other States.
American Lutheran Publication Board, Pittsburg, Pa.
95 pages. Price, 8 cts. net.

This record of the transactions of the English Missouri Synod at its late convention at Cleveland is valuable to the members of our own Synod because of the action taken at this convention in regard to "affiliation with the German Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States." The record on this matter is as follows:

The German Synod at its last general convention appointed a committee consisting of Rev. Prof. F. Bente, Rev. J. W. Miller, vice-president, and Mr. N. Schuetz to confer with us on the question of uniting the two synodical bodies. President Eckhardt appointed a preliminary committee to discuss this matter with them. The report of our preliminary committee as amended, adopted, and as presented to our congregations for their action is as follows:

Resolved, That our Synod is ready to consider a closer union with the German Synod by being received as a district, with the understanding,

1. That we turn our publication affairs over to the German Synod, but that a committee, the majority of which are members of the English district, be elected to get out such literature as our peculiar needs demand, such as the Hymn-Book, Sunday-School literature, pamphlets, etc.

2. That the *Lutheran Witness* be made the official English church paper of the whole Synod, but that its editor be chosen from the English district, or that the English district be given at least equal representation on the editorial staff (*Guide* also);

3. That English may be used on the floor of the Delegate Synod by members of the English district, and that at least a synopsis of the minutes of the Delegate Synod be read and printed in English;

4. That the Mission Board of the English district be permitted to start English missions wherever it deems such necessary, with due regard to the divine principles of parish rights (church membership) and Christian love;

5. That it be the rule that purely English congregations join the English district; that this, however, implies no censure upon such congregations which for special reasons do not follow this rule, and that in the last instance it be left to the discretion of each congregation to decide

upon its district affiliation, without, of course, disregarding the divine principle of Christian love;

6. That it be left to the English district how often it shall meet in convention;

7. That Concordia College, Conover, N. C., be turned over to the Delegate Synod.

Resolved, That congregations may also in connection with their action upon these articles take up the question of amalgamation with the German Synod.

Resolved, That these resolutions be submitted to our congregations for prayerful and careful consideration, and that they report, in writing, to the secretary of Synod the result of their deliberations not later than January 1, 1911, and that a congregation failing to report be counted acquiescing.

Resolved, That, if necessary, the president of Synod appoint three members of Synod to canvass the votes of the congregations.

Resolved, That our next sessions of Synod be held at the time and place of the German Delegate Synod.

Pastors Sachs, Detzer, Bernhardt, and Mr. Scheuermann requested to be recorded as having voted in the negative. Pastor Ruesskamp requested to be excused from voting.

A doctrinal paper on the subject of Church and State was read to the Convention by Prof. G. Romoser. The paper characterizes, in a very lucid style and compact grouping of relevant facts, 1. the Church, 2. the State, 3. the Relation between Church and State, 4. the Application of the Correct Doctrine concerning Church and State to Some Practical Matters.—An interesting addition, for which many will be grateful, is offered at the end of the Record, *viz.*, a Reprint of the Proceedings of the First Convention Held at St. Louis, Mo., October 19—23, 1888.

DOGMATIK VON A. HOENECKE. 5. Lieferung. 1909. Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis. Pages 321—400. Price, 40 cts.

The present issue completes § 28, The State of Innocence, and presents § 29, The State of Corruption; § 30, Of Guilt; § 31, Of Punishment, § 32, Of the Fall; § 33, Of Original Sin.

ADDENDA.

In last issue, p. 24, insert after Oxenham: *Validity of Papal Claims*, and change the reference at the end of paragraph beginning "Cardinal Merry del Val" to *Truth of Papal Claims*.